

The Classical Review

OCTOBER 1891.

THE vacation has witnessed the publication of two more volumes from the salvage of Greek literature reserved for our generation in Egyptian papyri. The former volume, which has been brought out by the Royal Irish Academy under the title *The Flinders Petrie Papyri*, is edited by Professor Mahaffy and contains the following fragments in addition to the *Antiope* lately printed in *Hermathena* (1) some brief scraps of Epicharmus and Euripides and two dramatic fragments of unknown authorship; (2) thirty-five lines of the eleventh *Iliad*, of which five do not appear in the text of Aristarchus, unfortunately only a few letters remain of each line; (3) portions of the *Phaedo* of Plato, embracing pages 67—69, 79—84 (this is supposed to have been written early in the third century B.C.); (4) a prose fragment on the contest between Homer and Hesiod; and (5) a variety of letters, wills, and other documents dating from the third century B.C. The palaeographer will find much to interest him in the thirty autotype plates which accompany the volume. We are further told that Professor Sayce has in hand many private letters, as well as documents containing the accounts of overseers, tax-gatherers, &c.; and that there still remains to be dealt with 'a store of unseparated fragments sent to the Editor by Mr. Petrie in November 1890.

The second volume is edited by Mr. Kenyon for the Trustees of the British Museum. It contains (1) the unemended text of seven poems by Herodas, written in iambic scazons, and giving scenes from everyday life, something after the fashion of the *Adoniazusae* of Theocritus. The author seems to have lived at Cos about the year 200 B.C.¹ The MS. is assigned to the second or third century after Christ. After this follows (2) the conclusion of a speech against Philippides, attributed to Hyperides, from a MS. of the second or first century B.C.; (3) the greater part of the third epistle of Demosthenes, of the same date; (4) the greater part of Isocrates *περὶ εἰρήνης*, dating probably from the first century after Christ; (5) a few lines of the *Iliad*, Book I., and a collation of nearly 900 lines (*Il. II. 101—IV. 40* omitting the catalogue), written in the fourth or fifth century after Christ; (6) fragments of the two concluding books of the *Iliad*, written in the first century B.C.; (7) written on the *verso* of (5) a short grammatical treatise bearing the name of Tryphon, and dating from the fifth or sixth century after Christ. This volume includes all the hitherto unpublished papyrus MSS. of literary works in the possession of the

¹ An improved text, with short notes, was brought out by Dr. Rutherford simultaneously with the Museum volume.

Museum. We subjoin Notes on Herodas by Dr. E. L. Hicks, Dr. H. Jackson, and Mr. Robinson Ellis, and Notes on the Fragments of the *Phaedo* by Professor L. Campbell, from whom we have also received some further notes on the *Antiope*, which will appear in a subsequent number. We hope shortly to give a review of the Dublin volume by Mr. Wyse, and one of the British Museum volume by Professor Jebb.

EMENDATIONS OF HERODAS.

MR. KENYON has put before us, as near as may be, the MS. text of these poems, and Dr. Rutherford has published his 'first recension' of the text. Much still remains to be done, and Dr. Rutherford would be the first to own how tentative his suggestions are. Like him, I bestowed some study upon the poems before Mr. Kenyon's text appeared. Some of my suggestions are incorporated in Mr. Kenyon's edition. The following emendations or explanations have also occurred to me. They may perhaps help other scholars to something better. I hardly think the time has yet come for publishing a corrected text, though I think I see my way to the continuous meaning of all the poems, except the mutilated poem vii., Σκυτεύς.

I.

3.—[τὴν δὲ] θύρην. W.G.R.'s ἔρειδε for εἰσώδε is probable. But strike out his interrogation, and read : τίς σὺ δαιμαίνεις κ.τ.λ.

7.—καλεῖ τις might equally well be assigned to Metrichè.

9.—θε[ὸς πρὸς] ἀνθρώπους had occurred independently to me.

18.—W.G.R.'s restoration [γῆρας φιλεῖ] unquestionably supplies the sense, if not the actual words, of the original.

19, 20.—Gyllis.

σὺ[λ]α[ν]ε ταῦτα τῆς νεωτέρης ἡμῶν πρόσεστιν.

Metrichè. Ἄλλ' οὐ τοῦτο μὴ σε θερμήνῃ.

Gyllis. ἄλλ' ὧ τέκνον, κ.τ.λ.

26.—W.G.R. rightly κεί for ἐκεί, κέθι. 'Tis there the Goddess has her home,' i.e. Aphrodite as the goddess of love and delight ; compare line 62.

34 foll.—W.G.R.'s text does not satisfy me. The sense runs on after ὤρμησαν :

[τὴν] δ' ὅψιν οἶαι πρὸς Πάριν κοβ' ὤρμησαν
[θεοὶ ἐπιφάναι καλλονῇ]—λάβοιμ' αὐτὰς
[λέγουσα]—κοῖνῃ οὖν κ.τ.λ.

For similar expressions of superstitious fear see iv. 58 ; vi. 34-35, 55-56.

37.—Perhaps τάχ' οὖν. MS. κατ' οὖν.

38.—[γῆρᾶσα] had also occurred to me ; it is indeed obvious.

39, 40.—I had written

[ἐκκλι]νον ἄλλη χημέρας μετέλλαζον
[τὸν ν]οῦν δὲ ἢ τρεῖς.

42.—I prefer [οὐκ ἀσφα]λής, which K. has printed.

45 foll.—Something of this kind :—

κοῦδὲ εἰς οὐδεν
[τὴν μοῖραν] ἡμέ[ων], ἄστατος γὰρ ἀνθρώποις
[καίρὸς τελευτῇ]—ἀλλὰ μὴ τις ἔστηκεν
σύνε[γγυ]ς ἡμῶν ;
Metrichè. οὐδὲ εἰς.

Gyllis. ἄκουσον δῆ.

50.—The first proper name needs to be explained or emended.

54.—πλουτέων τὸ κ[αλ]όν, i.e. καλῶς. Compare Theoc. iii. 3 ; Call. Ep. 56. 'With a handsome fortune.'

55.—Perhaps ἀθικτ[ος εἰς] Κυθηρίην σφρηγίς. 'An unbroken seal,' i.e. a heart untouched. Of course the forms in Κυθερ- are regularly used for Aphrodite ; but there seems no reason why the other form should be impossible.

56.—Read (with W.G.R.) καθ' ὁδὸν τὴν Μίσση. Μίσσα was a daughter of Isis according to some ; by other accounts, the daughter of Baubo the friend of Demeter. See Pape-Benseler s.v. Μίσση ; Hesych. s.v. Μισατίς ; Harpocration s.v. Δυσσαυλῆς, where for Νίσαν read Μίσαν. The street, therefore, in which Metrichè had been seen, probably led to a temple of Isis. At least we may suppose that Metrichè was on her way from or to a temple, or was taking part in a religious procession ; this would account the better for her public appearance. I have again looked at the MS. for l. 57, and read : ἐκμηνε | τὰ σπλάγχν' ἔρωτι καρδίην ἀνοιστηθείς.

60.—MS. καὶ τ' ἀγκαλιζει. W.G.R. καί σ' ἀγκαλίζει, which he translates " 'Has your name ever on his lips.' ἀγκαλίζει = ἀνακα-

λίξει." It is not impossible to suppose an active form of ἀγκαλίζομαι, and adopting σ' to translate: 'he clasps you (in imagination) to his bosom.' Or possibly τανταλίζει, 'he hovers about restlessly.'

64.—The second half of the line is torn away. MS. και οια πρήξεις ηδ—, οια being corrected from δια. W.G.R. writes: δι' οια πρήξεις ηδ σοι χάρις κείται—. Perhaps rather something like this:

καὶ οἷα πρήξεις ἥδε ῥήσις ἀρκεῖται,—]
δοθήσεται τι μέζον ἢ δοκεῖς.

66.—It is equally possible to make ναὶ μὰ τὰς Μοῖρας the end of Gyllis' speech especially if we adopt W.G.R.'s emendation φιλεῖ. MS. φιλέω.

71, 72.—W.G.R.'s text is very ingenious, but not quite convincing. Is it not possible to retain χωλὸν and ἐξεπαίδευσα? Rendering thus: 'By dear Demeter I would not have heard such words in patience from any other woman, but would have taught the bearer of so lame a tale to sing a lame tune, and to hate the sight of my doorstep.' There may have been a proverb τὸν χωλὸν διδάσκειν χωλὸν αἰδεῖν, of sending away a shuffling messenger, one who comes with a dishonourable proposal, with a blow for his pains. Or the proverb may come from the story of Thersites in *Il.* ii.

74.—MS. μῦθον ὅς μετρηταῖς | πρέπει γυναιξὶ ταῖς νεαῖς ἀπαγγέλλε. W.G.R. μῦθον ὅς τῆς μετρητῆς. I do not understand μετρητῆς. Possibly: μῦθον ὅς [γε] μητρῴης | πρέπει γυναιξὶ τῆς νέης ἀπάγγελλε. 'Carry to young women a story that befits one who mothers them.' μητρῴως would answer to ἀμμία of *l.* 7.

76.—Πύθεω of the MS. may stand, if we suppose a nom. Πύθης.

80.—W.G.R.'s conjecture is ingenious, but does not adhere to the MS. I read: [καὶ ἐ]κ[τ]ημό[ρ]ους [τ]ρεῖς [εἰ]τα [δεῦσον?] ἀκρήτον.

83.—Possibly: πείσονσά σ' ἦλθον, ἀλλ' ἀ[πρακτὸς] ὦν[ήμην], i.e. 'I am glad to be thus disappointed.'

II.

5 foll.—I can make no consecutive sense out of these sixteen mutilated lines. Note however προστάτης mentioned in *ll.* 10, 15. There was a board of προστάται at Cos, as will be seen from *The Inscriptions of Cos*, which Mr. W. R. Paton and I are just issuing from the Clarendon Press. I therefore retain προστάτην in line 40, where the MS. is dubious and W.G.R. writes προ-ταγῆν.

18.—ἐκ Τύρον τι τῷ δήμῳ evidently refers to a cargo (of wheat) which the shipmaster

Thales has imported from Tyre to Cos. He is likely to plead this service to the city by way of defence. The pandar anticipates him in *ll.* 19, 20:

—[δ]ωρεὴν γὰρ οὐθ' οὗτος πυροῦς
[εἰσάγαγ' ἐς] θῖν', οὐτ' ἐγὼ πάλιν κείνην.

Κείνην seems to refer to one of his own unholy wares, who must be supposed to have been alluded to in the mutilated lines.

27. τὴν αὐτονομίην. This the Coans had a right to boast of. I have remarked upon this in the Introduction to *The Inscriptions of Cos*, p. xxix. foll.

28, 29.—Read:

τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχρην ὅστις ἐστὶ κῆκ ποίον

πηλοῦ πεφύρηται εἰδὸθ' ὡς ἐγὼ ζῶειν κ.τ.λ.

38.—The full stop in W.G.R.'s edition must be a misprint.

40.—προστάτην, see note on *l.* 5.

44, 45.—W.G.R. is bold but not convincing. I think there is a proverb here, introduced by φησί. If λήγης κύρση may be understood passively = 'become a prey,' 'fall into the hands of the spoiler,' then we may suppose the original to have read somewhat thus:

μὴ πρὸς γ' ὁ χρυσός, φησί, καὶ τάπησιν ἡμῖν
τὸ τοῦ λόγον δι' τοῦτο λήγης κύρση.

i.e. 'Lest, as the proverb says, my gold and my raiment to boot,—I mean this my chance of pleading,—be a spoil to the robber.'

57.—ἐν Βρικινδύροις. Βρικινδύρα was a port of Rhodes: see Ross, *Inscriptiones Graecae ineditae*, iii. No. 277. It is mentioned in the Athenian tribute-lists (Köhler, *Urkunden und Untersuchungen zur Gesch. des Bundes*, p. 184), and was famous for its figs (Athenaeus xiv. 652; Julius Pollux, vi. 81). On the spelling of the name see Böckh-Fränkel, *Staatshaush.* ii. p. 432.

65.—τὰ ἐπέρθυρ' ὀπτά, 'my lintel is charred,' viz. by the torches of *ll.* 35, 36.

68 foll.—Is this a parody of the famous expedient of Hyperides in his defence of Phryne?

71, 72.—ὦ Γῆρας, | σοὶ θνέτω = 'Let him thank his stars that I was too old to fight him.' Then: ἐπεὶ τοί μ' ἂν ἐξεφύσσην κ.τ.λ. 'Else he would have swelled my passion.'

73.—Perhaps a good conjecture might be made with the MS. before one. Possibly ὁ Βράγχος, the mythical founder of the Branchidae; though I know of no story about him that suits our text. Or perhaps Φιλ... is the hero of the story, and ὁ βραγχός (raucus) his epithet. There must have been many merry tales current among these islands (ἐν Σάμῳ ποτε) of which we know nothing.

78.—'I am not young, like Thales, nor do

I pretend to be a gentleman; but, if you speak of courage, why, if I were Thales, I should say frankly and bluntly, "You are fond of Myrtale, perhaps; no wonder: and I tried to burn you all. Condone the assault, and here is Myrtale." Or else, if there is any part of my household that you have got fond of, pay Battaros cash down, and then take your property (*i.e.* Myrtale) and maltreat it as you please.' I cannot doubt οὐδὲν δεινόν of line 79, nor θλῆ of l. 83. It must however be confessed that ἐρᾶς κ.τ.λ. would suit far better if spoken by Battaros to Thales. I accept W.G.R.'s reading of lines 78, 80. For θάλλειν compare i. 76.

95 foll.—These lines interested me very much when I was writing the Introduction to *The Inscriptions of Cos*. They show how proud of their legendary glories were the Coans of the third century B.C. Battaros appeals to this pride: 'We shall see what all these distinctions come to, and whether Cos is any the better a town to live in for such divine favours.' Κόσον δραίνει in l. 93 = *quid valeat*. Line 97 contains the question: κὼς ἦλθε, 'with what intent he came.' W.G.R. wrongly alters κὼς to κοῦ'. So in l. 98 read: κήτικτε Λητοῦν ὧδε τεῦ χάριν Φοῖβη, where both K. and W.G.R. write ὧδ' εἴ' εὐχαριν.

III.

7 foll.—I think W.G.R. has quite missed the drift of the passage. I read thus:

συμφορῆς δ' ἦδη
ὀρμᾷ ἐπὶ μέζον, χοῦ μὲν ἡ θύρη κεῖται
τοῦ γραμματιστέω καὶ τριηκᾶς ἡ πικρή
τὸν μισθὸν αἰτεῖ κῆν τὰ Ναννάκον κλαύσω
οὐκ ἂν ταχέως λέξειε (MS. ληξείε) τήν γε μὴν
παίστρην,

ὁκουπερ οἰκίζουσιν οἱ τε προῖνικοι
χοῖ δρηπεται σάφ' οἶδε χήτέρῳ δέξαι.
The tears of Nannakos, as the explanation of the proverb (see Kenyon *ad loc.*) proves, were tears of supplication. The boy has played truant from the elementary school so long that he scarce could tell the way to it, though his mother asked with tears on her cheeks, and though (as the mother painfully recollects) his fees are due as his name has been on the list.

12.—παίστρη = 'playground,' 'the idle corner,' exactly analogous to παλαίστρη: compare ll. 64, 65.

19 foll.—W.G.R. has deserted the MS. In l. 19 I transpose λι (which might the more easily have got out of place through NAI following), and read with the MS.:

αἱ δορκάδες δὲ ναὶ λιπαρώτεραι πολλὸν
ἐν τῇσι φύσῃσι τοῖς τε δικτύοις κείνται
τῆς Ληκύβου ἡμέων τῇ ἐπὶ παντὶ χρώμεσθα.

'His pets lie about upon the bellows' (was the father a smith?), 'and the nets' (fishing was universal in the islands), 'and are sleeker, fatter, than our oil-flask which we use for everything.'

22.—'He does not know how to tell the syllable A, when he sees it': γρῶναι, 'to recognize.'

24 foll.—'Three days ago, when his father was teaching him to spell MARON, he turned him into SIMON, did this bright youth.' It seems to have been a lesson in dictation. Μάρων has nothing to do with Virgil, as K. shows in his Introduction. The following are the instances I have noticed of the name Μάρων occurring as pure Greek and not as a transliteration from the Latin: *C.I.G.* iii. p. xiv. No. 6; *ibid.* p. xv. No. 87 (cp. Dumont, *Inscriptions Céramiques*, pp. 198, 285), both are from Cnidian amphora-handles; Dittenberger, *Syllogē*, No 77, l. 12, l. 43, from Iasos; *C.I.G.* 3846z⁷⁰, from Aezani in Phrygia, late but apparently not Roman; *C.I.G.* 4325k, from Olympus in Lycia, late but not Roman; *C.I.G.* 276, 284, among the ἐπὶγράφοι in the Athenian Ephebic lists, and possibly therefore Roman, but quite as probably not; *C.I.G.* 2850f, fragment of an epitaph from Aphrodisias, apparently Greek; *Bulletin de Corr. Hell.* i. 336, Maron a deity (late), from Olbasa in Pisidia; Dionysus and Maron united in worship in *Bulletin de Corr. Hell.* v. 93, viii. 51, from Maroneia. It will be observed that nearly all these examples come from Asia Minor and the Eastern Aegean; in other words, from the regions indicated by these poems.

30 foll.—ῥῆσιν. They try to teach him 'a piece' of poetry to say by heart, οἷα παιδίσκον, 'as a little boy should.'

33.—ἐνθαῦτα ὅπως μιν ἐκ τετρημένης ἡθεῖ (*sc.* χύτρας). I take ὅπως as = ὥς. 'He lets it run out of his head as out of a cracked pot.' W.G.R. is certainly wrong here.

34 foll.—I put no stop after l. 33, and write the whole passage thus:

ἐνθαῦτα ὅκως μιν ἐκ τετρημένης ἡθεῖ
—'Απολλὸν ἀγρεύ, τοῦτό φημι—χή μάμη
τὰ λῆς ἐρεῖ σοι (κήστὶ γραμμάτων χήρη)
χὼ προστυχῶν Φρύξ.

'It runs out of his head like a cracked pot, —I do declare, by Apollo, it's true,—and yet his poor old grandmother, who doesn't know her letters, will say off the piece you ask for, and the slave-lad who may chance to be by.'

43.—κοῦ τόσος λόγος τοῦδε is part of the mother's speech. She is a voluble woman, and her temper is up, so that she runs on without a break.

44.—MS. ὁ κέραμος πᾶς ὥσπερ ιττα θλῆται.

W.G.R. writes *ἱρῖα*, of the *cracking* of the roof tiles. I had suggested *ἱρία*, of the *bending* of the tiled roof under his weight, 'like a willow.'

46.—*ἐκάστου τοῦ πλατύσματος*, 'for every tile that is found to be broken,' when the roof is being repaired before the rainy season.

49.—W.G.R.'s conjecture *ὥστε μὴδ' ἰδόντα κινῆσαι* is excellent; 'so as to move even one who has not witnessed him.' She then proceeds to give *ocular evidence* of a kind: *ὄρη δ' ὁκοῖως κ.τ.λ.*

55.—*παιγνίην*: 'the holidays.'

57.—I retain *αἶδε*, understanding the Muses, who are invoked in ll. 1 and 71, and appear to be referred to in l. 97. There were probably statuettes or reliefs of the Muses to be seen in front of the school-master's house. Read:

ἀλλ' εἴ τί σοι, Λαμπρίσκε, καὶ βίον πρῆξιν
ἰσθλὴν τελοῖεν αἶδε κἀγαθῶν κύρσαις,
μὴ ἔλασσον αὐτῶν Μητροτίμῃ ἐπέυχουσι,
ἔξει γὰρ οὐδὲν μέζον.

I accept W.G.R.'s *μέζον* for MS. *μειον*, and I alter the unmetrical *ἐπευχεο* into *ἐπεύχοιο*.

64.—*ἀστραβδόκος* is a conceivable word, for *ἀστραβοδόκος*, from *ἀστράβη*, *δέχομαι*, 'you pack-ass!' *ὥσπερ οἶδα* (MS. *οἶδε*) refers to *δορκάσιν παίζειν*, 'as I understand your habit to be'; and the next words convey a distinct statement *πρὸς δὲ τὴν παίστην...χαλκίζεις*.

I write the whole passage thus:—

δέξον τέ σ' αἰνέω τάργα, Κότταλ', ἃ πρῆσσεις·
οὐ σοι ἐτ' ἀπαρκεῖ τῇσι δορκάσιν παίζειν,
ἀστραβδόκ', ὥσπερ οἶδα; πρὸς δὲ τὴν παίστην
ἐν τοῖσι προνίκουσι χαλκίζεις φοιτέον.

67.—W.G.R.'s conjecture is brilliant and convincing.

70.—MS. *πριν χολη βῆξαι*. W.G.R. *πριν χολὴν λῆξαι*, 'before my anger cools.' This sounds weak. Perhaps the MS. is right: *πριν χολῇ βῆξαι*, 'before my bile begins to choke me.'

71-73.—W.G.R.'s treatment of these lines is a brilliant piece of criticism. It would be just possible, however, to read in l. 71: *μή, μὴ ἱκετέω*, *Λαμπρίσκε*, and in l. 72 to understand *τῆς τε κοτιδος ψυχῆς* of 'the very life of your brain, or head.'

74, 75.—A slave-dealer selling a slave was under the strongest temptation to conceal his vices, and under Roman law the vendor was liable for an untrue warranty (*Dict. of Ant. s.v. Servus*, p. 665): *οὐδ' ὅκως χωρῆς*, 'not even to get rid of you.'

79.—May not *εἴ τί σοι ζῶν* be an optative? 'If I live under your lash.' If so, the MS. is right.

80.—*φέρειν* depends on *σθένει* and governs *ὄσας*.

87.—MS. *οὐδ' ἐκλήξαι*. W.G.R. *οὐδ' ἂν ἐκλήξαις*. Perhaps better *οὐ δέον λῆξαι*.

89 foll.—The speech of Metrotime continues unbroken to the end of the poem. The hydra is proverbial for labour in vain, and *ποικιλωτέρος* does not refer to the wheals in the boy's back, but to his artful ways and endless resources; this is why he needs chaining. *τὸ μὴθέν* 'at the least,' 'as a mere nothing.' Write the passage thus (ll. 87 foll.):—

οὐ δέον λῆξαι,
Λαμπρίσκε, δαῖρον δ' ἄχρῃς ἥλιος δύσῃ·
ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὑδρὸς ποικιλωτέρος πολλῶ,
καὶ δεῖ λαβεῖν μιν κήπῃ βυβλίῳ δῆκον
τὸ μὴθέν ἄλλας εἰκοσὶν γε κ.τ.λ.

96, 97.—Write

ὅκως μιν σύμποδ' ὦδε πηδεύντα
αἱ δὴ θεαὶ βλέπωσιν ἄς ἐμίστην.

σύμποδα πηδεύντα form an *οενημοσιον*: with his feet tied, he could struggle but certainly could not jump or run. It is spoken in banter. The goddesses again are the Muses.

IV.

1 foll.—The best illustration of the poem would be the votive reliefs discovered of late years in the Asklepieion at Athens, south of the Acropolis. The text of lines 1-30 is fairly certain, and I agree with W.G.R.'s corrections. Perhaps however in l. 16 *πολλῆς φορήνης* of the MS. is right, and is a genitive of quality.

30 foll.—The sentence runs on without break. The old man is looking down on the boy at his feet playing with a goose; you would think he was going to speak to the boy, it is all so life-like. See K.'s note, and read:—

κείνον δὲ Κυνοῖ τὸν γέροντα, πρὸς Μοῖράων,
τὴν χηνάλωπεχ' ὥς τὸ παιδίον πνίγει
πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν γούν, εἴ τι μὴ λίθος τοῦργον
ἐρείς Ἀαλήσει' κ.τ.λ.

35 foll.—She points now to a portrait-statue, as a proof of the sculptor's realism. Read:—

τὸν Βατάλης γὰρ τοῦτον οὐχ ὀρῆς Κυνοῖ
ὅκως βέβαιος ἀνδρώαντα τῆς Μῦττω·
εἰ μὴ τις αὐτὴν εἶδε Βατάλην, βλέψας
ἐς τοῦτο τὸ εἰκόνησμα, μὴ θέης δείσθω.

The order of words in 35-36 is *οὐχ ὀρῆς τοῦτον ἀνδρώαντα τὸν Βατάλης τῆς Μῦττω ὅκως βέβαιος*. I take both *Batale* and *Myttes* for proper names ('lisper' and 'mute'): the stone image is really dead and mute. It would be well to examine the other proper names in Herodas, and see how far they are suggestive and suitable. This is certainly the case with *Πατακίσκος* in l. 63 (see W.G.R.'s note).

41 foll.—None of Herodas' poems seem complete unless a slave gets a sound rating. Poor Kydilla is a dull, stupid wench, and stands gaping and inattentive.

42.—οὐ σοι λέγω αὐτὴ τῇ δίχ' ὥδε χασκεύσῃ; i.e. 'yawning as if you would come in two'; the phrase is vulgar.

44.—ἔστηκε δ' ἐς μ' ὀρεῖσα καρκίνον μέζον, the comparison is with the outspread, squat, inert position of a crab, and his fixed unmeaning stare. So the maid, fat, lounging, with arms a-kimbo, and a fatuous stare. Compare vii. 123.

46-51.—The fault of l. 47 is not easy to emend. I can suggest nothing better than with W.G.R. to read οὔτε | βέβαιον εἶναι, though I should prefer something nearer the MS. At the end of l. 47 perhaps we might restore πανταχῇ δ' ἐν ναρ[κ]ῇ or possibly:

λαίμαστρον οὔτ' ὀργῇσι κρηγύνῃ οὔτε
βέβαιον αἰνεῖ πανταχῇ δ' οἰκ[κ]ῇσαι!

Kynno's temper is sorely stirred; she feels herself 'to be swelling, as it were, with anger against her will.' She would like to give the hussy a good beating on the spot, but they are in the temple, and religion forbids.

53.—The beating is, however, only postponed for a more fitting opportunity; the girl, if so she goes on, will get her head broken one of these days. Restore:—

μαρτύρομαι, Κυδῖλλα, τὸν θεὸν τοῦτον,
ὡς ἐκ με καίπερ οὐ θέλουσαν οἰδῆσαι,
μαρτύρομαι, φῆμ', ἐς σε τῇμέρῃ κείνῃ
ἐν ᾗ τὸ βρέγμα τοῦτο τῶϊζυρὸν κνήσῃ.

52 foll.—The friend replies, in order to soothe her wrath:—

μὴ πάνθ' ἐτοίμως καρδίῃ βάλοι, Κυννοί,
δοῦλῃ 'στὶ, δοῦλῃς δ' ὥτα νωθρῇ θλίβει·
ἀλλ' ἡμέρῃ γε κῆπὶ μέζον ὠθεῖται,

i.e. she is dull, but gentle, and is progressing somewhat with a little pushing.

56.—καὶ ἀνέεται ὁ παστός, 'the shrine is thrown open,' from ἀνίημι.

57.—κοινὴν is not impossible, they see the hand of an Athena everywhere. Read:—

οὐχ ὀρῆς, φίλῃ Κυννοί
οἳ ἔργα; κοινὴν ταῦτ' ἐρεῖς Ἀθηναίην
γλύψαι τὰ καλὰ· χαίρετω δὲ Δέσποινά.

For the latter invocation, to excuse a too irreverent use of the goddess' name, see note on i. 34.

59.—There seems no reason why the MS. κνίγω should not stand; it would be an unknown 2nd aor. of κνίζω. But perhaps better κνίσω.

65.—W.G.R.'s text of the preceding lines is obviously right, but I retain ἀργυρεῖν πεποιῆσθαι.

68.—ζῶν ἡμέρην cannot be 'still life.' Read ζῶν βλέπουσι χῆμῆρην.

72-78.—All one unbroken speech by Kynno. It is important to make it out, for it contains a very remarkable and very ancient tribute to the skill of Apelles. If ψαύειν may govern a dative, we may take the MS. as it stands:—

ἀληθινὰί φίλῃ γάρ αἱ Ἐφεσίου χεῖρες
ἐς πάντ' Ἀπέλλῳ γράμματ', οὐδ' ἐρεῖς 'κείνος
ὠνθρωπος ἐν μὲν εἶδεν ἐν δ' ἀπηρηνήθη,'
ἀλλ' ὧ ἐπὶ νοῦν γένοιτο καὶ θεῶν ψαύειν
ἡπείγεθ'· ὅς δ' ἐκείνον ἢ ἔργα τὰκείνου
μὴ παμφαλῆσας ἐκ δίκης ὀρώρηκεν,
ποδὸς κρέματ' ἐκείνος ἐν γραφέως οἴκῳ.

"Aye, for the genuine hand of Ephesian Apelles, dear, is seen in all (these) paintings, nor will you say of him 'He was a man who could see one thing, but could not see another'; nay, whatever god it crossed his mind to handle, that god he hastened to handle." Apelles was, of course, as famous for his ideal creations, as for his portraits. μὴ παμφαλῆσας, 'without due respect'; ἐκ δίκης, 'robbing him of his due.'

79 foll.—The sacristan comes to announce that the offerings of the women have proved favourable, and promise greater blessings for the future; never was Asklepios better pleased. In 80 I retain μεζόνως, putting a colon or full stop after ἐμβλέποντα. I gratefully accept W.G.R.'s attribution of αὐτῇ τῆς ὑγίης λῶ to Kottale. For the rest my restoration is as follows:

Sacristan.

ἰή, ἰή Παῖτρον, εὐμενῆς εἴης
καλοῖς ἐπ' ἱροῖς ταῖσδε κεί τινες τῶνδε
ἔασι ὀπιυῖτά τε καὶ γεγῆς ἄσπον.

85 ἰή, ἰή Παῖτρον, ὠδε ταῦτ' εἴη.

Woman.

εἴη γάρ, ὦ μέγιστε, χυγίη πολλῇ
ἔλθοιμεν αἰτίς, μέζον' ἱρ' ἀγινεύσαι
σὺν ἀνδράσιν καὶ παισὶ. Κοττάλη, καλῶς
τεμεύσα μέμνεο τὸ σκελῦδιον δοῦναι

90 τῷ νεωκόρῳ τοῦρνιθος, ἔς τε τὴν τρώγλην
τὸν πέλανον ἐνθεσ τοῦ δράκοντος εὐφήμως,
καὶ ψαιστὰ δεύσον τάλλα δ' οἰκίης ἔδρη
δαισόμεθα· κῆπὶ μὴ λάθῃ φέρειν.

Kottale.

τῆς ὑγίης λῶ.

Woman.

πρόσδος· ἢ γὰρ ἱροῖσιν

95 μέζον ἁμαρτίης ἢ ὑγίη 'στι τῆς μοίρης.

I read ἔασι in l. 84, and ψαιστὰ in l. 92. The suggestion of sweethearts and kinsfolk in l. 84 leads up to the prayer about husbands and children in l. 88. In l. 93 foll. Kottale is advised to make an offering for herself afterwards out of the share of

αὐτῇ

good things she gets at home. She at once assents, for she too desires to enjoy the blessing of health. 'Make then the additional gift,' says the lady, 'for by means of sacrifice does Hygieia overcome whether transgression or fate,' i.e. the goddess here worshipped with her father, in return for sacrifice, heals us of sickness or prevents it seizing us, whether as the result of sin or of evil-fate. Here, as elsewhere in these poems, we are introduced to the actual thoughts and superstitions of the Greeks of the Hellenistic period.

V.

1.—For $\eta\delta$ of MS. read $\eta\varsigma$ or $\eta\sigma\theta'$.

11.— $\lambdaύσας$ may stand, if we take $\alpha\lambda\lambda'$ $\epsilon\theta'$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\alpha\varsigma$; as merely parenthetical.

18.— $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho'$, $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$; $\delta\eta\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$ κ.τ.λ.

30.—Possibly $\mu\epsilon\theta'$ $\eta\varsigma$ $\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\nu$ $\omicron\nu\tau'$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\phi\eta\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$, i.e. 'you and she deserve to grind together in the same slavery, you, my cast-off leavings.'

41.—MS. $\omicron\delta\eta$. W.G.R. $\sigma\mu\eta$. Possibly $\theta\lambda\eta$, 'hit him,' which suits the violence of Bitinna and follows the *ductus literarum*.

52.— $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\mu\iota\kappa\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\varsigma$, 'the house of Mikkale', see Dr. Field's note on St. Luke ii. 49. Bitinna begins to feel the unwisdom of 'washing one's dirty linen in public.'

56.—She is now angry with Pyrrhies for having obeyed her orders and led off the culprit: he has (she declares) used quite unnecessary violence.

59.—Both Pyrrhies and Gastron shall be thrown into chains together. I feel sure that $\acute{\alpha}\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ refers to some kind of fetters or stocks.

66.—She will have both of them branded. $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}$, i.e. Pyrrhies. $\mu\eta$ $\omicron\delta\phi$, 'all under one,' at the same time as his fellow-slave.

67, 68.— $\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\rho\eta\sigma\theta\omega$
 $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\mu\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma$ $\omicron\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ η $\Delta\acute{\alpha}\omicron\nu$ $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}$,
i.e. while we are punishing Davus for his pilferings let us punish the mouse as well. In other words, Gastron and Pyrrhies are both guilty, they differ only in degree.

69.— $\mu\eta$ $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}$ $\tau\iota$ $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ $\nu\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$, i.e. 'spare him even now, at the eleventh hour.'

70.—Batyllis seems to be a daughter of Bitinna by this self-same favourite.

77.— $\omicron\upsilon\sigma\eta\nu$ $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\nu\nu\omicron\nu$, 'seeing I am mistress in my own house.'

81.— $\nu\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ σ' $\acute{\alpha}\phi\eta\sigma\omega$, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\chi\epsilon$ $\tau\eta\nu$ $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\nu$
 $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$
 $\tau\eta\nu$ $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu$ $\eta\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$ η $\beta\alpha\tau\upsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$ $\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omega$,
κ.τ.λ.

'Thank Bitylla for your release; I love her like my own daughter, for I have brought her up from a child.'

84, 85.—

$\epsilon\pi\eta\nu$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ $\epsilon\chi\chi\eta\tau\lambda\acute{\omega}\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$,
 $\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\omicron}\tau'$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\eta\nu\delta'$, $\epsilon\omicron\rho\tau\eta\nu$ $\epsilon\acute{\xi}$ $\epsilon\omicron\rho\tau\eta\varsigma$.

'And when we have paid our libations to the dead, why you shall of course marry her, and make festival upon festival,' the marriage festivity shall come on the top of the other solemnity.

What this festival was we do not know, except that it was in honour of the dead. There were $\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ at Athens, and the Epicureans were called $\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\delta\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}$ because they kept the twentieth of each month in honour of their founder's memory (Schömann, *Griechische Alterthümer* ii. 549). Is this referred to here? Of the 'Gerenia' (l. 80), held $\epsilon\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\tau\eta\nu$ ($\mu\epsilon\tau'$ $\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\varsigma$) i.e. the twenty-fifth, I know nothing. W.G.R.'s suggestion is worth noting.

VI.

1.— $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\sigma\omicron$, $\mu\eta\tau\rho\acute{\iota}$, $\tau\eta$ $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\eta\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\epsilon\varsigma$ $\delta\acute{\iota}\phi\rho\omicron\nu$. This is nearer the MS. $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota\alpha$ = $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu$.

9.—If $\delta\acute{\iota}\phi\rho\omicron\varsigma$ may be used in the masculine by Herodas, then $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ refers back to l. 1. The servant, alarmed by her mistress' voice rating her for her idleness, bustles up to dust and polish the chair. Or perhaps for $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ rather read $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\nu$.

10.— $\omicron\tau'$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\chi\rho[\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota]$; $\lambda\eta\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\iota}$, $\theta\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}$ $\mu\omicron\iota$
 $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$.

Coritto wants the girl to be off about her business, that she may talk secrets with Metro. 'Why does the wench begin tidying and polishing up the room, when they want to use it? You pirate! be off along this way! or else—' $\lambda\eta\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, because impudent and unwelcome.

15.—Restore:

$\alpha\lambda\lambda'$ $\omicron\upsilon\nu\kappa\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu$ $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ σ' $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$, $\epsilon\kappa\pi\omicron\delta\omicron\nu$ $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$
 $\phi\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\nu$ $\omicron\rho\iota\sigma\tau\upsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\omicron\tau\alpha$ $\mu\omicron\iota\nu\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\gamma\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$,
 $\tau\grave{\alpha}$ δ' $\alpha\lambda\lambda'$ $\epsilon\omicron\rho\tau\eta\varsigma$.

'Now I have come to see you, all my worries are vanished and fled. When bosom-friends meet ears and tongues alone are busy, all else keeps holiday.' Perhaps better $\delta\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\upsilon\acute{\iota}$. This is spoken also by Metro, by way of soothing Coritto. I assign lines 12—21 continuously to Metro.

23.— $\mu\acute{\alpha}$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\gamma\lambda\upsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$ sc. $\omicron\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, for perhaps in so saying she kisses her friend's forehead or eyes.

26, 27.—Perhaps we may read:

$\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon$ $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\alpha\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$

$\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\varsigma$ η $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$ $\mu\eta$ $\gamma\upsilon\nu\eta$ $\kappa\omicron\tau'$ $\epsilon\kappa\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\phi\epsilon\iota$.

'Saying, as she gave it away, women would not so much as notice whether the same woman wore it out'; i.e. nobody would notice the change of owners.

28.—What is $\beta\alpha\nu\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$? Pretty certainly a head-gear, a band for holding the hair. It

was stitched (l. 27, 47), and was laced up (l. 72). I incline to think it a sort of night-cap, from *βανβάω*.

33 foll.—*τᾶλλα Νοσσίδι χρήσθω,
τῇ—μὴ δοκέω μέζον μὲν ἢ γυνὴ λέξαι,
λάβοιμι δ', Ἀδρήστεια!—χιλίων εὐντων,
ἐν' οὐκ ἂν ὅστις σαπρὸς ἐστί προσδοίην.*

44, 45.—

*τί μοι ἐνβλέπεις γελῶσα; νῦν ὁρώρηκας
Μητροῦν τὸ πρῶτον; ἢ τί τὰβρά (τὰ ἄβρά) σοι
ταῦτα;*

Coritto has looked her in the face with a smile of coy and coquettish deprecation.

47. The whole line is Metro's: *ἀλλ' εἶπε
τὸν ῥάβαντα. μᾶ ἦν τί μοι ἐν εὐχῇ*, i.e. 'I vowed I would find it out.'

56.—This pious wish, 'May her friends never forget her!' is in keeping with the other indications of religious awe in these poems; see note on i. 34 and iv. 95.

59-61.—

*... ἦκει, φαλακρός, μικρός· αὐτὸ ἐρεῖς εἶναι
Πηγεῖνον, οὐδ' ἂν σῶκον εἰκάσαι σῆκφ
ἔχοις ἂν οὕτω, πλήν κ.τ.λ.*

I fancy *αὐτὸ* may stand, either as a kind of adverb, or else *per timesin* for *αὐτοπρήξινος*, like *αὐτοάνθρωπος*, *αὐθόμυρος* and the like (see Viger, *De idiotismis*, note on p. 134).

64.—*τελώνας*. One would like to know whether these taxes were merely local, to support the government of Cos, or to supply tribute to Ptolemy. Whether or no Cos was exempt from such tribute, it was certainly *αὐτονόμος*, and in high favour with the Egyptian kings (see *The Inscriptions of Cos*, Introduction).

67.—*ἔωθεν δύο γὰρ ἡλθ'*, or *ἐκέθην* i.e. from his shop just described.

68.—*ἰδοῦσα μ[έντοι] τῶμματ' ἐξεκύμνην*. 'The sight of them however set my eyes in a flutter': for the verb, compare i. 56.

69.—What *τὰ βάλλια* are (assuming the MS. to be correct) I do not know. They must be some portion, or some ornamentation, of the *βανβάν*; possibly some kind of border, or ornamental stitches, or eyelet-holes.

70.—*αἰταὶ γάρ*, if correct, must be connected with a verb in the first person plural, e.g. *ἴσμεν*, which would complete the metre.

71, 72.—

*ἀλλ' ἢ μαλακότης ὕπνος, οἱ δ' ἱμαντίσκοι
ἔρια, οὐχ ἱμάντες.*

'Its softness is sleep itself' (a delightful bit of rhetoric), 'and the laces are wool not thongs,' i.e. though of leather they are more like wool.

77.—K. finds *ταταλίζουσα*, which I had conjectured, to be perfectly in accord with

the remains of letters in the MS. The meaning is plain, 'calling him deary.'

80.—*ἔδει γὰρ ἀλλὰ καιρὸν οὐ πρόποντ' εἶναι*. ['But that was out of the question,] for, you must know, the moment was doomed to be inopportune, for Bitas' slave came in upon us—

82.—*αὕτη γὰρ ἡμέων ἡμέρην τε καὶ νύκτα
τρίβουσα τὸν ὄνον σκωρήν πεποίηκεν,
ὅκως τὸν ἐωυτῆς μὴ τετρωβάλον κόψῃ.*

'For she by coming to grind night and day has reduced my mill-stone to powder, for fear of shattering her own at a cost of four obols'; i.e. Bitas' quern was out of repair and cracked, and worth but a few pence, therefore to save it, his slave is perpetually coming in to borrow Coritto's.

89, 90.—

*δεῖ [δ], εἰ μὲν Ἀρτεμῖς τι καινὸν εὐρήσει,
πρὸσω πιεῖσα[ν] τὴν προκυκλὴν θάλ[πει]ν,*
i.e. 'It is but right, if Artemis makes any fresh discovery, for her to taste herself and then hand on the cup to others.' The peculiar meaning of *προκυκλῶ*, *προκυκλῖς*, *προκυκλία* we now know from the title of i.; they are synonymous with *προαγωγέω*. The verb *προκυκλῶ* is (I believe) only in the Rhodian Swallow-song (Athen. 360), *παλάθαν σὺ προκύκλει | ἐκ πίονος οἴκου*: clearly its use there is humorous and figurative, 'procure, betray us a fig-cake.' And precisely so *προκυκλῶ* in the line before us.

96.—*ἱγίαινε*, 'Good-bye.' At the end of the line perhaps *[πάλαι μὰτ[ην] χωρεῖ]*.

VII.

74 foll.—Cerdo loquitur:—

Ἐρμῇ τε Κέρδων, καὶ σὺν κερδεῖα Πειθοῖ!

75. *ὥς ἦν τι μὴ νῦν ἡμῖν ἐς βόλον κῆρση,
οὐκ οἶδ' ὅκως ἄμεινον ἢ χύτρη πρήξει.*

'Unless some fish comes now to my net, my fish-pot is likely to be badly off.' This is an aside; hence the next speech.

Μητροῦ.

*τί τονθορύξεις κοῖκ ἐλευθέρῃ γλάσση
τὸν τίμον ὅστις ἐστὶν ἐξεδίφησας;*

Κέρδων.

γίναι, μῆς μνῆς ἐστὶν ἄξιον τοῦτο

80. *τὸ ζεύγος, ἢ ἄνω σ' ἢ κάτω βλέπειν' χαλκοῦ
ρίνημ' ὃ δὴ κοτ' ἐστὶ, τῆς Ἀθηναίης
ὠνευμένης αὐτῆς, ἂν οὐκ ἀποσταῖται.*

'If Athena herself were my customer, not a fraction would I abate of the price, ever so small.'

Μητροῦ.

*μάλ' εἰκότως σευ τὸ στεγύλλιον, Κέρδων,
πέπληθε δαψιλέων τε καὶ καλῶν ἔργων,
(i.e. if you sell them so dear,)*

85. *φύλασσε καλῶς αὐτά: τῇ γὰρ εἰκοστῇ
τοῦ Ταυρέωνος ἢ Ἐκάτῃ γάμον ποιεῖ
τῆς Ἀρτακηνῆς, χυποδημάτων χρεῖη'*

τάχ' οὖν τὰ λῆς πρόσσεισι σὺν τύχῃ πρὸς σε.
μᾶλλον δὲ πάντων ἀλλὰ θύλακον βάψαι,
90. τὰς μνείας ὅκως σοι μὴ αἱ γαλαῖ διόισονσιν.
Metro declines to pay his price, and so to
beat him down she has recourse to banter.
'There's the festival coming on the 20th of
Taureon, when Hecate makes a ἱερὸς γάμος,
(a mystery festival in honour of our Lady of
Artace and her marriage with Pluto). There
will be a demand for shoes (among the
ladies). No doubt you will get your prices,
and have good luck. But be sure, above all
else, to stitch you a wallet to hold your coins,
for fear the "cat" spirits them away.' He
replies, 'Though Hecate came to my shop,
or our Lady of Artace herself, she shall not
be asked less than a mina.' Cyzicus was
famous for the worship of Demeter and
Proserpine: see Greenwall's *Electrum
Coinage of Cyzicus*, pp. 11, 12; Propertius
iv. 22, 4; Plutarch, *Lucullus*, 10; Appian,
Mithr. 75. Of course these passages say
nothing of Artace, the suburb of Cyzicus,
nor of any temple of Proserpine thereat;
but they make my suggestion the more
probable.

91 foll. may provisionally be restored as
follows. So much of the papyrus is muti-
lated here that even the drift of some lines
is obscure; but where the MS. is entire, I
feel pretty confident of my readings.

ΚΕΡΔΩΝ.

"Ἦν τ' ἢ Ἐκάτῃ ἔλθῃ μνήστ' ἔλασσον οὐκ οἶσει,
ἦν τε ἢ Ἀρτακηνή.

ΓΥΝΗ.

Πρὸς τὰδ' εἰ θέλεις σκέπτειν
οὐ σοὶ δίδωσι καὶ ἡ ἀγαθὴ τύχῃ, Κέρδων,
ψαῦσαι ποδίσκων ὧν πόθοι τε κήρωτες
ψαύουσιν ἄλλ' οἷς κνῖσα καὶ κακὴ λώβῃ. 95
ᾧστ' ἐκ μὲν ἡμέων διαφόρως σεωντοῦ πρήξεις,
ταύτῃ δὲ δώσεις κείνο τὸ ἕτερον ζεύγος.
κόσων πάλιν; πρήμνον ἀξίαν φωνήν
σεωντοῦ.

K. Στατήρας πέντε· ναὶ μὰ θεοὺς φοιτᾷ
ἡ ψάλτρι' [Εὐ]ετηρὶς ἡμέραν πᾶσαν 100
λαβεῖν ἀνώγονσ', ἀλλ' ἐγὼ μιν ἐχθαίρω
κῆν τέσσαράς μοι δαρικοὺς ὑπόσχεται,
ὁτοῦνεκέν μεν τὴν γυναῖκα τωθάξει
κακοῖσι δεινοῖς.

Γ. Εἰ [δὲ χρημάτων] χρεῖη,
φέρ', εὐλαβοῦ [δῆ] τῶν τριῶν θέλεις] 105
δοῦναι
καὶ ταῦτα καὶ ταῦτ' [— — —] δαρ]εῖκὼν
ἐκρητὶ Μητροῦς τῆσδε;

K. Δ[εῖνον οὐ φήσ]ει[s
εἶ]ναι τό μ' ἐλάσαι σαρ[δά]λων γε τεχνίτην?]
ἰόντ' ἀλθινὸν ἐς θεοὺς ἀνα[π]τῆ[ναι];

Γ. Ἐχεις γὰρ οὐχὶ γλάσσαν ἢ δ[ύ]νῃ δῆ
ἐλθεῖν. 110

K. M]α, θεῶν ἐκείνος οὐ μακρὴν ἀ[πο ζώει]
ὁτέω σὺ χεῖλεα νύκτα χημέρην οἰ[γνυς].
φέρ', ὡδε τὸν ποδίσκον εἰς [χ]νος θῶ[μεν].

(He proceeds to measure the lady's foot,
or to try on a sandal.)

Γ. Πάξ' μήτε προσθῆς μήτ' ἀπ' οὖν ἔλῃ μηδέν.
K. Τὰ καλὰ πάντα τῆς καλῆσιν ἀρμόζει. 115
αὐτὴν ἐρείς τὸ πέλμα τὴν Ἀθηναίην
τεμεῖν. δὸς αὐτῇ καὶ σὺ τὸν πόδα.—

(He proceeds to do the same for the other
lady.)

ψωρή
ἄρηνεν ὅπλῃ βοῦς ὁ λακτίσας ἡμᾶς.
εἰ τις πρὸς ἰχνος ἠκόνησε τὴν σμίλην,
οὐκ ἂν (μὰ τὴν Κέρδωνος Ἑστίνην) οὕτω 120
τοῦργον σαφέως ἐκεῖτ' ἂν ὥς σαφέως κείται.—

(An inquisitive lady stares in at the door in
passing, and seems amused at the group.)

αὐτὴ σὺ, δώσεις ἑπτα δαρικοὺς τοῖδε,
ἡ μέζον ἵππου πρὸς θύρῃ κιχλίζουσα.—

(To the customers.)

γυναῖκες, ἣν ἔχητε χητέρων χρεῖαν
ἢ σαμβάλισκων ἢ ἅ κατ' οἰκίαν ἔλκειν 125
εἴθισθε, τὴν δούλην [μὲν] ὡδε [δεῖ] πέμπειν
σὺ δ' ἡκε, Μητροῖ, πρὸς με τῇ ἐνάτῃ πάντως
ὅκως λαβῆς καρκίνια· τὴν γὰρ οὖν βαίτην
θάλπουσαν εὖ δεῖ [τ]ὸν φρονουῦντα καὶ ράπ-
τειν.

94.—See the Cupids in attendance at the
toilet-scenes so common upon Greek *myxides*.

95.—I gladly adopt W.G.R.'s reading.

96.—διαφόρως is not far from the letters
of the MS.

98.—W.G.R. is probably right in his
punctuation.

104-107.—Merely a suggestion of the
probable drift.

107-109.—My suggestion is very doubt-
ful, but still possible. The shoemaker is a
testy fellow with a sharp tongue. But he is
beginning to relent; for Metro is a very
valuable customer, and the other lady has
talked him down. Half seriously he com-
plains of their hard treatment of him. They
beat him down so much that he will have
to leave; he is an honest man, and this un-
fair world is not fit for him; like Astraea,
he will have to flit to the gods.

110.—'If he reaches the gods, it will not
be by virtue of his tongue.'

113.—I feel pretty sure of [χ]νος. It
may mean either the sole of a sandal (so
line 119), or perhaps a pattern sole for
measuring the size of the foot.

114.—Clearly the lady's exclamation.
He has fitted her perfectly; he cannot
better it.

117, 118.—The proverb must mean: 'Anybody who flouts such charming ladies must be an ill-conditioned fellow indeed.'

119–121.—'To sharpen one's knife on the sole of one's shoe' seems proverbial for a careless, untidy, inaccurate workman. This perfect fit could never have been turned out by rule of thumb.

123.—She grins like a horse: the comparison is confined to the mouth. See on iv. 44.

128–129.—The jerkin that keeps one warm a wise man will take care to keep mended': *i.e.* Metro is a good customer, and therefore shall be well attended to.

The metaphor in *βαίτη* is appropriate to a *σκυτεῖς*. The saying is an aside, and Metro is not supposed to hear it.

I have not been at pains to restore the correct dialectical forms: this would require further study, for which I have had no time. The way in which staters and darics are spoken of in the last 25 lines of No. vii. is worth the attention of numismatists. The stater is the silver stater, I suppose, or tetradrachm, which was current coin. The (gold) daric was no longer current, but seems used like our guinea to express a large sum. It is as if we talked of crowns and guineas.

E. L. HICKS.

i. 1, 2. θ.....α αράσσει την θυρην τις ουκ οψι
.....παρ ημεων εξ αγροικιης ηκει

Dr. Rutherford writes

Θρέισσ', ἀράσσει την θύρην τις· οὐκ ὄψει
εἰ τις παρ' ἡμέας ἐξ ἀγροικίης ἦκει;

Θρέισσ' is plainly right. But may we not keep the *παρ' ἡμέων* of the MS. and read *τίς τῶν παρ ἡμέων ἐξ ἀγροικίης ἦκει*?

40, 41. χιλαρη καταστηθι
.....s αλλον

Dr. Rutherford conjectures *ἀνδρῶν πρὸς ἄλλον*. As Herondas lengthens a short vowel before *πρ* at iii. 62 and v. 76, why not *ἀνδρα πρὸς ἄλλον*?

47, 48. αλλα μη τις εστηκες
συνε[σ]τ' υ[φ] ημων

The editor tells us that 'a dot is placed over the last letter' of *εστηκες*, 'presumably to cancel it,' and that *ημεων* is 'apparently corrected to *ημιν*.' Is it certain that the sixth letter of 48 is *τ*, and not *γ*? I think that the scribe meant

ἀλλὰ μή τις ἔστηκε
σύνεγγυς ἡμῖν;

(As *σύνεγγυς* takes both genitive and dative, the variant *ἡμέων* is quite intelligible.) Gullis, now that she is coming to the point of her discourse, is anxious to assure herself that there is no one within hearing.

69–72.

και την φιλην Δημητρη ταυτ εγω[γ]ε αλλης
γυναικος ουκ αν ηδεως ε[π]ηκου[σ]α
χωλην δ αι δειν χωλον εξεπαυδενσα
και της θυρης τον ουδον εχθρον ηγεισθαι

Dr. Rutherford writes in 71 *χωλὴν δ' αἰ*

δεῖν πῶλον ἐξεπαιδεύθην. I think that the reading of the MS., differently divided, should be retained:

χωλὴν δ' αἰδεῖν χωλὸν ἐξεπαιδεύσα.

'I would have taught her to keep to birds of her own feather, and to hate the sight of my doorstep.'

ii. 71, 72.

ω γηρας

σοι θυετω επ...τον μαν εξεφυσησεν.

Dr. Rutherford reads *ἐπεὶ τόλμαν*. I think that the text of the MS. is substantially sound, and that we should read

ω γῆρας,

σοι θυέτω· ἐπεὶ τὸν ἔμ' ἂν ἐξεφύσησεν.

'Old age, he should render a grateful sacrifice to thee; for such exertions would have made *me* a proud man.' For *τὸν ἐμέ*, compare Plato *Philebus*, 20 B. That a dactyl is admissible in the third foot, appears from iv. 19.

iii. 8–13.

κου μεν η θυρη κειται

τον γραμματιστεω και τριηκας η πικρη
τον μισθον αιτι κην τα Ναννακον κλανσω
ουκ αν ταχεως ληξει την γε μην παιστηρην
οκον περ οικιζουσιν οι τε προνικιοι
και δραπεται σαφ ουδε κητερωι διξει

Apparently the mother complains that her boy, though ready enough to guide any one to the Casino, will be in no hurry to tell or show the way to the school-house. Hence for *ληξει*, I desiderate *λέξει* or *δείξει*. Is it certain that the initial letter is *λ*? (I suppose that *καὶ τριηκὰς ἢ πικρὴ τὸν μισθὸν αἰτεῖ*,

κῆν τὰ Ναννάκου κλαύσω is a mere by-the-by.)

19-21.

αι δορκαλίδες δε ναι παρωτεραι πολλον
εν τρησι φυσηις τοις τε δικτοις κεινται
της ληκυθου ημεων τρη επι παντι χρωμεσθα

The editor adds: 'δε ναι: at first written, *δαι*, but *έν* is written above, apparently for insertion.' Is it possible that what was 'at first written' was, not *δαι*, but *δλι*, and that the supposed *ν* is in reality the mark of a short syllable as in iv. 62? I suspect that the scribe found *αι δορκαλίδες* δὲ *λιπαρώτεραι πολλόν*, and added the mark over the *ι* to show his appreciation of the false quantity. I understand Metrotime to say—'his knuckle-bones—which from much use in the past are brighter than the family *λήκυθος*—are now neglected.' But was Herondas guilty of the false quantity which the conscientious scribe has preserved? Is it possible that the letters *λι*, which have intruded themselves into *δορκαδες*, are a survival from an earlier reading?

58. Μητροιτιμη επευχεο

Both metre and sense suggest *Μητροτίμη*, μὴ ἐπύχεο. Lampriscus, interrupting, assures the anxious mother that prayers are unnecessary: her boy shall have all she asks.

63, 64.

ου σοι ετ απαρκει ταισι δορκασιν παιζειν
ἀστράβδ' οκωσπερ οιδε

The sense is plain: 'you are no longer content to play at dibs with knuckle-bones, like your school-fellows.' But is it not likely that the name of the game was *ἀστράδα*, rather than *ἀστράβδα*?

68. κον μοι το δριμν σκυλος η βοος κερκος
ωι

Dr. Rutherford points out that the *ν* in *σκυλος* is short. Should we read
κὺ μοι τὸ δριμνὸ σκύτος—ἡ βόος κέρκος—
ὦ κ.τ.λ.?

77, 78.

κοσας κοσας λαμπρισκε λισσομαι μελλις
ες μεν φορησαι μη με τηνδε δ ιρωτα

Dr. Rutherford reads *ἐς μ' ἐνφορήσαι*. I imagine that Lampriscus' interruption deprives us of an obvious accusative. For the order of the words, compare v. 76 *ἐς μεν δικάϊως τὸ πρόσωπον*.

iv. 42. ου σοι λεγω αἴτη τρη

Dr. Rutherford writes *αἴτη*. Rather, as the accent indicates, *αἴτη*.

v. 4-11. Adopting from Dr. Rutherford *χρέω μοι ὅκη* and *ἰμονήθρην*, and writing, for *Ἀμφυταιν*, *Ἀμφυταίη*, I would distribute and punctuate these lines as follows:

Γ. ἐγὼ Ἀμφυταίη; τὴν λέγεις ὀρώρηκα
γυναῖκα;

B. προφάσεις πᾶσαν ἡμέραν ἔλκεις·
'Βίτινα, δούλός εἰμι· χρέω μοι ὅκη βούλει,'
καὶ 'μὴ τὸ μεν αἶμα νύκτα χῆμέρην πίνε.'
ὄσσην δὲ καὶ τὴν γλᾶσσαν οὗτος ἔσχηκας—
Κύδιλλα, κοῦ ὅστι Πυρρίης; κάλει μοι αὐτόν.

Π. τί ἐστι;

B. τοῦτον δῆσον—ἀλλ' ἔθ' ἔστηκας;—
τὴν ἰμονήθρην τοῦ κάδου ταχέως λύσας.
vi. 1, 2.

καθησο Μητροι τρη γυναικας ες διφρον
ανασταθεισ[α]

So B. M. But in the note we read: 'Apparently the scribe began to write *γυναικιδος*, but altered the word before reaching the last letter, as the last two letters of *γυναικας* are written over *δο*. The *α* however is not certain, and as there is a dot above it, it may be intended to be cancelled.' I suspect that the letter which follows the dotted *α* is not *ς* but *θ*: in other words, that the scribe began to write *γυναικὶ δός*, and then substituted *γυναικὶ θές*. The words *τῇ γυναικὶ θές διφρον ἀνασταθείσα*, as well as the sentences which follow, are of course addressed to the servant.

9-11.

νυν αυτον [ε]κμασσις τε και ποις λαμπρον
οτ ετι χρ . . ληστρι θεε μοι ταυτη
επει σε γε . . αν των εμων εγω χειρεων

Dr. Rutherford's excellent *σ' ἔγευσ'* ἄν is plainly to be accepted. To complete the sense of the passage, it only remains to write

νυν αὐτὸν ἐκμάσσεις τε καὶ ποιεῖς λαμπρὸν
ὅτ' ἐστὶ χρεῖη. ληστρί, θεέ μοι.—ταύτη·
ἐπεὶ σ' ἔγευσ' ἄν τῶν ἐμῶν ἐγὼ χειρῶν.

'There? just when the chair is wanted, it has to be dusted and cleaned. Make haste, thief!—That will do: else,' etc.

70. αυται γαρ..... It seems obvious to write *αὐταὶ γάρ ἐσμεν*, and to treat these words as a parenthesis.

96, 97.

νγιναι εμ λαματ . . χωρει
ημ . . φ.....στι

The last words of 96 would appear to be *μάτην χώρει*: 'you may have your journey for nothing!' The moment that Metro has gone, Coritto, talking to herself, reveals the secret: she has bought *both* the 'articles of apparel,' if that is the right phrase, and Metro will take nothing by her visit to Artemis.

101.

ωρν[ν]θ αι κην τρεφει τις εν κολπω
Read:

ὠρνυσθ' ἄρ' ἐχιδναὶ κῆν τρέφῃ τις ἐν κόλπῳ.

vii. 50, 51.

τ[α]υτην . . υμνα . . ανη Μητρ[οι]
το ζευγος ετερον χατε[ρ]ον μαλ εξοισει

Read :

τουτ' ην κου μιν αλγύνη, Μητροῖ,
τὸ ζεύγος, κ.τ.λ.

'If this pair hurts the foot, he shall bring
out another and then another.'

vii. 124-126.

γυναικες ην εχιτε κητερων χρευνη
η σαμβαλισκων η ακατοικων ελκιν
ειθ ισθε την μοι δουλ[ην] ωδε πεμπιν

So B. M. In 126 Dr. Rutherford writes :

εἰθισθε, τὴν μοι . . . ὥδε δεῖ πέμπειν.

To complete the line, I propose

εἰθισθ', εἴτην μοι ἢ δοῦλον ὥδε δεῖ πέμπειν.
128, 129.

την γαρ ουν βαιτην

θαλπουσαν ευδειν δολιφρονουντα και ραπτιν

So B. M. But the editor adds the note :
'δολιφρονουντα : or δονφρονουντα, which
certainly seems to be what the scribe
actually wrote.' Read :

την γαρ οὖν βαίτην

θάλπους ἀνευ δεῖ ὕδον φρονούντ' ἀκᾶ ράπτειν.
Cerdon pompously excuses himself for fixing
a distant day : the sewing will require cool
reflection in the privacy of his studio. It
will be seen that this distribution of the words
does not entail any deviation from the text
of the MS. With ἀκᾶ ράπτειν, compare per-
haps iv. 57 οἱ ἐργα κούνην which I suppose to
represent οἱ ἐργ' ἀκᾶ νείν : 'what triumphs of
needle-work !'

HENRY JACKSON.

CANNES.

9 September, 1891.

I.

3. εσωδε is clearly εσωθε, and should not
be altered.

9. Perhaps τί σὺ θέλεις πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ;
'what do you want with civilized men ?'—
what errand makes you force your way into
respectable society ?

19, 20. The punctuation is perhaps thus :

σίλλαινε ταῦτα· τῆς νεωτέρης ὑμῖν
πρόσεστιν· ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦτο μὴ σε θερμήνη.

'Jibe on as you will : it is natural to
young women like you : but it will never
give you any real warmth'—such as you may
get from me.

37. Read κατ' οὖν λήσεις.

39-41. Read

χῆμέρας μετάλλαξον
[τὸν ν]οῦν δὲ ἢ τρεῖς, χίλαρῃ κατὰσθηθι
κλίνας' (οἷς νεύουσ') εἰς ἄλλον.

55. Perhaps ἄθικ[ος ἐς] Κυθηρείην σφρη-
γίς, 'a pure gem for Aphrodite's service.'

56. Obviously ἰδὼν σε καθ' ὁδοῦ τῆς μέσης.

60. ἀγκαλίζει, 'fondles.'

62. κατάρτησον. I think in a less dis-
tinct sense than that suggested by Ruther-
ford : 'turn all your thoughts to Aphrodite,'
'have no thought except for love' : tota
pende ex Venere, h.e. toto animo, tota mente.

64. καὶ λῶα πηρίξεις ἢ 'δόκεις ποτ' ἂν
πρῆξαι.

74 sqq. μετρημαῖς seems to be μὴ 'ταιρείαις
(μὴ ἐταιρείαις) 'keep for younger women such

a tale as would be indecent to prostitutes.'
μὴ would thus = μηδέ.

II.

28-30.

ὃν χρῆν' ἐαυτὸν ὅστις ἐστὶ κακ ποίου
πηλοῦ πεφύρητ' εἰδότη', ὡς ἐγὼ ζῶειν
τῶν δημοσίων φρίσσοντα καὶ τὸν ἥκιστον.

Rutherford is strangely wrong here.

44. κυσθος seems to be a neuter form of
κυσθος sens. obsc. τάτης perhaps for ἀπάτης,
= ἀπατεών.

72. Perhaps σοὶ θνέτω, ἐπεὶ ὢν τόλμαν
ἐξεφύσσησεν : ἐπεὶ by itself is metrically too
weak, I think.

78. θαρσέων λεηλατοῦμ' ἂν εἰ Θαλῆς εἴη.

So I conjectured before seeing Mr. Head-
lam's paper in *Athenaeum* of Sept. 12. He
however reads εἴην, as Rutherford. I retain
εἴη, 'uirtutem uero quod attinet, fidenter
ipse praedas abigam si ex Thaletis domo
abigendae sint.'

79. οὐδὲν δευὸν looks right, in spite of
the dots over δ and ε of οὐδέν. It is diffi-
cult to imagine anything more Greek or
more completely in character.

III.

32, 33 may be right as printed by
Kenyon : 'assuming the part of an old man
stricken both in ears and eyes, he proceeds
to strain him out as it were from a jar with

holes, drop by drop.' I would explain this of some gesture the boy makes, in ridicule of the slow and painful way in which an old man discharges his water or dribbles out his words.

50. *ρακιν* is, I think, 'his spine' not 'the bridge of his nose,' as R.

55. *οτ ημος* looks right, at any rate ought not to be altered summarily.

58—60 may perhaps be written thus

μη' λασσον αὐτῶ —

Λαμπ. Μητροτιμή [μη'] πένχεο.

ἔξει γὰρ οὐδὲν μείον.

'as you would be happy and fortunate, Lampriskus, give him no less'—*Lampr.* 'Metrotima, no imprecations: he shall get what you wish all the same.'

62. *δείκοντες* with *οὐκ ἀρείτε*. The school-master orders the offending Cottalus to be lifted on the back of one of the slaves and whipt, thus *exposing*, or perhaps, *making him an example*. The attitude is familiarly known by the Pompeian picture.

64. *αστραβδα* looks genuine. It probably describes the posture of boys playing with each other [Mr. Headlam compares *κίβδα*] at some game of dice. *οἶδε* like the lads we see; not any that he sees at the moment, but like Latin *hi*.

πίστρη like *πίστρη* must be a *place*, cp. *ποσίτρη*. Cottalus knows the way to the recognised playground of the looser characters—the common porters and runaway slaves.

66. *κινευντα* *μηδε καρφοστο* *το γ ηδιστον*. The meaning seems to be: 'I will make you as well-behaved as a girl, you shall be so still as not to set the least bit of chaff astir.' Then *κάρφος* must be separated from *ι*, and *τό γ' ηκιστον* written with R. But what then is *ι*? *ἐν* is the only suitable word that occurs: *ει* seems barely admissible.

71. Rutherford thinks that Cottalus abridges *Lampriskus* to *Priskus*. Would not this be dangerous while the whipping goes on? I should prefer to drop the *Α*. The boy's fright might make him drop *one* letter, hardly *three*.

75. *χωρεῖν* seems here to mean 'go off well,' i.e. sell at a good price.

79. Possibly *ει ἔτι* (so R.) *συζῶν*, 'if I consent to live with you,' instead of running off to my grandmother's.

82. Perhaps *οὐκέτ' οὐχί* *τοι* *πρήξω*: or even *οὐχί* *τι* *πρ*.

87. *ουδεκλῆσαι*. R. *οἶδ' ἂν ἐκλήξαις*. But the *κ* is a genuine relique: read therefore *οὐδέκω λήξεις* or *οὐδέκω ἂν λήξαις*.

90, 91. *δήκον* may be rightly given by the papyrus. The following words *τὸ μηθὲν ἄλλ'*

ἐς εἰκοσὶν γε appear to mean 'nothing short of as many as twenty lashes at the least.'

IV.

16. *υἱτρα* like *θρέπτρα* is unexceptionable: 'we should have offered something better than a cock as our fee for Asklepios' healing our complaints.'

20. Perhaps *τῆς ὑγιῆς μου* *μὰ καλῶν*.

26. Papyr. *ευθις*, which may be right; she plays on the name. 'May Paeon be gracious to these as to us, and may he be a veritable *forwarder* (Euthies) of fine workmanship.'

36. Possibly *ὄκως βιβᾶ*, *τὸν ἀνδριάντα* *τῆς Μύττω* (? *Μύσττω*).

42. *αὐτη* is difficult; we should expect *αὐτως*. I suggest that *αὐτῇ* was used for *αὐτως*: the rest of the v. was perhaps *τῇδε* *χῶδε* *χασκούση*.

44. *καρκίνου μέζον* is not to be altered. The slave stares, making great eyes like a crab.

46. Read *οὐτ' ὀργῆς σε κρηγύνῃ οὔτε βέβηλος αἰνεῖ*, *πανταχῇ δ' ἀργὸς κείσαι*: 'neither priest nor layman has a word of praise of your goodness: everywhere you lie idle.'

49, 50. She takes Asklepios to witness her vexation at the idleness of the slave, *ὡς ἔκ μ' ἐκναίσας οὐ θέλουσαν οἰδῆσαι*. Theocr. xv. 88 *ἐκκναίσειντι πλατεῖαδοῦσαι ἅπαντα οἰδῆσαι*, *irasci*.

54. Surely the meaning is: 'But day has come and is moving on.' The door is opened accordingly. *κατεῖθ'* for *καὶ ἀνέιται* should not be altered: the shrine may now be entered.

57. *κουνῃν*, the papyrus: *καὶνῃν* would be easier—a new Athene, i.e. Athene in her latest development as patroness of art and the last inventions in art.

67. It is difficult not to believe that *ἀνάσιμος* should be read for *ἀνάσιλλος*. For (1) this is suggested by the immediately preceding *χῶ γνῆς οὗτος*, (2) it is not certain that *ἀνάσιλλος* can be used adjectively.

68. *ζοῆν βλέπωσιν ἡμερῃν* has a strangely modern look. I do not remember to have seen the combination elsewhere.

72 *sqq.* Here Rutherford has quite missed the meaning. Without changing a word of the papyrus as printed by Kenyon, translate: 'they are the absolute lines of Apelles; you will never say "That man saw one thing, was denied the sight of another." Not so: but whatever came into his mind, he pressed on to attain that even at a run. If there be any who has looked upon Apel-

les or his works without the due awe they claim, I wish he may hang by the foot in a fuller's shop.' One change alone is needed; ἄλλ' ωι ἐπι can hardly be anything but either ὁ ἐπὶ or οὗ ἐπὶ, by attraction, i.e. ὦ 'πὶ.

82-85. I read thus:

ἰὴ ἰὴ Παῖρον, εὐμενὴς εἴης
καλοῖς ἐπ' ἱροῖς ταῖσδε, κεί τις ἐκ τῶνδε,
ἑταῖς ὀπνύηται τε καὶ γενῆς ἄσπον.

'et si qua ex his prognata fuerit, nubat pro-
pinquorum alicui nec longe a familia sua.'

γενῆς not γονῆς is also given by the papyrus in II. 1.

90. Cf. Prop. iv. 8, 7-14.

92. καὶ ψαιστὰ δεύσον.

V.

6. χρῶ ὅ τι καὶ βούλει.

18. φέρ' εἰς σὺ.

41. ὁδῇ the papyrus: σμῇ Rutherford: possibly θλῇ 'smash his nose'; so vii. 7. κόπτε τὸ ῥύγχος.

68. Perhaps ἡ Δάω 'ντίμη (Entima).

69. Read μὴ παιτῶ ἀλλὰ νῖν μὲν &c.

73. For μὴ λυπεῖτε με read μὴ λυπεῖτ' ἡμί.

85. This v. must have ended, I think,

...ἵτιν ὀρτὴν ἐξ ὀρτῆς,

But what the last adjective is I cannot see. The metre will not bear ἀλκονοῖτιν.

VI.

1. Κάθησο, Μητροῖ, τῇ γυναικας ἐς δίφρον.
ἀνασταλείσαν πάντα δέ με προστάσσειν
αὐτήν.

ἀναστα- is all that Kenyon vouches for: but ἀνασταθείσαν seems to me hardly suitable. I suggest ἀνασταλείσαν. Koritto is impatient, and declares she must tuck up her dress and see to her orders in person.

5. ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰς σὺ.

Slave. μὴ ἰλλά τᾶλφει' ἦν μετρῆς.

10. The name was, I believe, *Thalestris*. Read therefore ὄτ' ἐς τι χρόν. Θάληστρι, θύέ μοι ταύτῃ.

The slave only begins polishing up when the moment calls for it to be done. If therefore she escapes a beating from her mistress, she may thank the visitor for it (θύε ταύτῃ, sc. to the visitor, Metro). Metro having thus saved the slave, deserves her σῶστρο. It was customary σῶστρο θύειν.

16. νωβυστρο looks like a formation of the same kind as νουβυστικός.

26-29. αὐτῃ-αὐτῇ-αὐτῇ-αὐτῇ, an unexampled recurrence in these poems. In 27,

where the papyrus gives γυναικας αὐτῇ μὴ γυνῇ ποτ' ἐκτριψί, Rutherford edits γυναικας αὐτῇ μὴ γυνῇ κοτ' ἐκτριψῇ; assigning the v. to Koritto. It might, I think, be equally well a continuation of Metro's, with αὐτῇ for αὐτῇ, in the sense of αὐτῶς: 'she gave orders that no one should see it, for fear a woman some day ruin her kind unthinkingly.'

32 sqq. with διξαι or ενδιξαι for ...ξω might be explained as printed by Kenyon: 'aliam pro nobis amicam indaget quae posthac Nossidi (= sibi) familiaris sit, quoniam ei non uideor maiora quam ex mulieris modulo ostendisse: nam, quod pace dixerim Nemesis, mille mihi si praesto sint, ne unum quidem uelim adsciscere, qui modo insincerus sit'. She seems to mean (at least primarily) friends: but there may be an under-allusion.

45. Aut quid sibi uolunt hae deliciae? 'these affected airs.'

59. αὐτὸ ἐρεῖς εἶναι Πρηξίνον is simply 'you will say it is the very ideal Praxinus,' id ipsum quod est Praxinus: cp. αὐτοῖπιπος, αὐτοάνθρωπος &c.

66, 67. I would suggest αὐτῆς ὁρᾶν τὰς χεῖρας, οὐχὶ Κέρδωνος, δόξεις. [ἐγὼ δ'] ἐν, δύο γὰρ ἡλθ' ἔχων, Μητροῖ, ἰδοῦσα μ[οῖνον].

69. τα βαλλι recalls ταβαλί, a Persian word for *tympaenum*, 'atabal.' But it is difficult to see how these could resemble the article described in the poem. Or can it be an abridgment of σαραβάλλια a diminutive of σαραβάλλα, loose trousers, like those worn by the Persians?

80. Possibly ἔδει γαρ' ἄλλ' ἄκαιρον. οὐ πρέπον τῷνα.

'Debebam sane, sed occasio non erat: non est res ducenda'; or, ἀλλὰ καιρὸν οὐ π. τῷνα, 'sed non decebat occasionem plus aequo tendere,' i.e. to abuse the opportunity.

98. The words ἐξαμβροῖσαι and τείρειω (so I read) point to the meaning: cp. i. 33, Catull. lxi. 200.

VII.

1. The v. perhaps ended with εἰ τι.

38. ταθρα may be τερθρα.

50. Perhaps ταῦτ' ἦν [δῶ] ἑμίν, ἂν δ' ἀνῇ Μητρώ, 'see let me give you these, and if Metro lowers her terms.'

52. ἔστ' ἂν [τέλος] πεισθήτε [μῆδ'] ἔτει ψευδέα.

65. ἀπεμπολῇ[σαι].

80. ἡ ἄνω σ' ἡ κάτω βλέπειν is unexceptionable: 'it is worth a mina from what

ever point you look at it'—examined either side, top or bottom.

95. *ισκνυσα* seems to be a word connected with *ισχνός*. Perhaps there was a noun *ισχνός* 'withering' 'shrivelling': the *a* would then be *ā*, a change from the particularizing *ποδίσκων* to a more general object. This however would involve constructing *ψαύειν* with an accusative. It may equally well be a participle: 'non tibi contingit pedes tractare quos tractant Veneres Cupidinesque sed quos macies et mala deformitas.' Notice the Catullian cast of the language *ὦν πόθοι τε κήρωτες ψαύουσιν*.

96. The indications of the papyrus as stated by Kenyon suggest either *ὥστ' ἐκ μὲν ἡμέων δις λῶω σέο πρήξεις* or *ὦ. ἐ. μ. ἢ. λῶα δις σέο πρήξεις*, duplo fortunatior eris quam ante fuisti.

110. Perhaps

*ἔχεις γὰρ οὐτι γλαῖσαν, ἡθύνην δ' ἡθεὶ
ἀθέων ἐκείνος οὐ μακρὴν ἀφιστηκὼς
ὅστω σὺ χεῖλεα νύκτα χήμερην οἴγνυς.*

ἀφίστηκεν, οἴγνυς Rutherford: 'non tu linguam habes, sed tanquam colum in os ingeris isti impio cuius labra semper irru-

mando aperis.' On this view, the words are said by one of the women to Kerdon, who thereupon lowers his tone (113).

In the difficult passage ii. 17—21 it seems clear that *παρώτεροι* is the comparative *παρότεροι*—the meaning being either that the dice (*δορκάδες*) are of much more account in Cottalus' estimation than his slate; or that, when the distrest mother looks into the *λύκυθος* which serves as a general family repository for things stowed away, the dice are found with the fire-bellows and nets at the top, and the slate beneath them; showing that the former have been used recently, while the slate has been thrust away with other lumber out of sight. On this latter hypothesis, which I conceive to be the more probable, I would write the vv. thus

*κῆν δόκοτ' αὐτὴν ὥσπερ 'Αἶδην βλέψας
γράφῃ μὲν οὐδὲν καλόν, ἐκ δ' ὅλην ἔξογῃ,
αἱ δορκάδες νῆ Δι παρώτεροι πολλὸν
ἐν τῇσι φύσης τοῖς τε δικτύοις κεύνται
τῆς λυκύθου ἡμέων ἢ ἐπὶ παντὶ χρώμεσθα.*

ROBINSON ELLIS.

ON THE TEXT OF THE PAPYRUS FRAGMENT OF THE *PHAEDO*.

§ 1.—The fragments of the *Phaedo* of Plato represented on Plates v. vi. vii. viii. of Professor Mahaffy's facsimiles belong to two of the most impressive passages of the great dialogue, viz. pp. 67-69 (of Stephanus) *οἰκοῖν, ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης, εἰ ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ, ... δικάσταις, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι*, and pp. 79-84 *θῶμεν οὖν βούλει, ἔφη, δύο εἶδη τῶν ὄντων... καὶ διαπτομένη οἰχεται καὶ οὐδὲν ἔτι οὐδαμοῦ ᾗ*. The former is immediately followed by the interposition of Cebes, the latter by the silence preceding the reluctant statement of his difficulties by Simmias. This fact is in so far favourable to the supposition that the MS. was an excerpt of favourite places (carried with him perhaps by some soldier to fortify him against the fear of death, as others have carried the Bible or the *Imitatio Christi*) rather than a complete and authenticated copy of the whole dialogue. The same hypothesis would serve to excuse what the editor-in-chief has justly characterized as 'patent blunders,' which, although less gross than those in later papyri, would yet be surprising in a copy prepared for sale to educated readers within a century of Plato's death. How in any case such a precious roll

could find its way to the waste-paper basket is a bewildering puzzle.

§ 2.—The following is a list of such manifest errors:—

Plate v. (3) l. 13 (68 D).—*ναὶ μάλα for καὶ μάλα*. The eye of the scribe has glanced aside to the preceding *εἶναι*, with a vague sense that the expression gives assent. (Has *ν* been retouched at the upper right-hand point so to make a rough *κ*?)

Ib. l. 10.—*τομ[θ]αν[ατον] for τὸν θάνατον*. This is treated by the editors as a normal case of assimilation! Did the scribe pronounce *τὸν φάνατον*?

Ib. l. 15.—*ὑπομειμω[σιν] for ὑπομένωσιν*.

(4) l. 1 (68 E).—*τουτο for τούτω*.

Ib. l. 2 (68 E).—*τοι επ for το περι*.

vi. (3) l. 13.—*ἀπῆλλαγμεν]ηι for ἀπῆλλαγμένην*.

Ib. l. 18.—*οι μεμιασμενη for οimai μεμιασμένην*.

vii. (4) l. 7 (84 B).—*ζων for ζῆν*.

Ib. (2) l. 5 (82 A).—*παρακελευεσθαι for παρακελευομένην*.

* viii (4) l. 19.—*δοκεινης for δ' ἐκείνης*—(but is the *ο* certain?)

(On grounds to be stated presently, I do

not count v. (2) l. 7 *ιδι* nor vi. (4) l. 9 *ειθισ-μένη*.)

The presence of these 'patent blunders' (about one for each page of Stephanus) supplies a reason for dealing cautiously with points affecting the order, and the omission or addition of single words, as well as the still more striking variants in which a whole phrase is differently expressed. And it should be premised that the effects of careless writing are not the same where the language is one with which the copyist is familiar as where a work of an earlier epoch is being mechanically transcribed.

§ 3.—Before proceeding to doubtful points, however, let me mention places where the papyrus furnishes new and all but *certain* readings.

v. (1b.) l. 10 (68 A).—*ἡ παιδων ἐνεκα* for *καὶ υἱέων*.

v. (3) l. 22 (68 E).—*σωφρονοῦσιν* for *σώφρονές εἰσιν*.

v. (4) l. 10 (69 A).—*συμβαίνει δ' οὖν* for *ἀλλ' ὁμῶς αὐτοῖς συμβαίνει*.

vi. (3) l. 1.—*τὸ δὲ* for *τοῦτο δέ*.

vi. (4) l. 4.—*οὐ ἂν τις* for *οὐ τις ἂν*.

vii. (3) l. 7.—*ἐπόμενοι* for *ἐκείνη ἐπόμενοι*.

vii. (3) ll. 8, 9.—*πῶς λέγεις, ἔφη, ὦ Σώκρατες;* *ἐγὼ ἐρῶ* for *πῶς, ὦ Σώκρατες; ἐγὼ ἐρῶ, ἔφη*.

viii. (2) l. 18.—*τίς τι* for *τις*.

Pap. E.

v. (3) l. 7 (68 D).—*γε*

Ib. l. 12.—*κακῶν εἶναι* (so d Stobaeus b mg.)

vi. (3) l. 12 (81 A).—*ἀνθρωπίνων* (CD).

Ib. l. 16.—*μετὰ θεῶν*.

(4) l. 14 (81 C).—*ἀλλὰ* (with Stobaeus and a corrector of B).

vii. (2) l. 14.—*φιλόσοφοι*

viii. (4) l. 3 (83 D).—*ἀναπλέα τοῦ σώματος*

vii. (4) l. 8 (84 B).—*δεῖν οὔτω*

Probably also, though not so transcribed, the papyrus in vii. (2) l. 11 read *ἄλλωι* with Edb.

In v. (3) l. 15 E's *εἶναι μάλα* is nearer to the papyrus' *εἶναι—ναὶ μάλα* than to the *εἶναι—καὶ μάλα* of B and most MSS.

In two of these places E is in agreement with some earlier authority, viz. with D (Bekker's II) or Stobaeus, and in two with a corrector of B. There remain four at least in which this late MS. was hitherto the only witness for the readings in question.

§ 5.—Not less significant is the fact to which Mr. Starkie (?) has called attention in the note on viii. (1) l. 11 (not quite in

viii. (4) l. 13.—*οἱ πολλοί* for *οἱ πολλοὶ ἕνεκα φασίν*.

§ 4.—The places are about as numerous, and in this the papyrus reads an instructive lesson, in which what has hitherto been a later MS. reading is supported against an earlier. In particular, the Venetian MS. 184, once the property of Cardinal Bessarion (Bekker's Ξ, Schanz's E) a 'learned' MS. of the 15th century, agrees repeatedly with the papyrus while differing from the Bodleian (a dated MS. of 896 A.D.). And here our editors, elsewhere so careful, cannot be acquitted of a somewhat strange inaccuracy. It happens that the corrector of another Venetian MS. (185, Bekker's II, Schanz's D, a 12th century *codex* corrected in the 15th century) sometimes agrees with the copyist of Ξ (Schanz's E as aforesaid). Hence in Schanz's critical notes such readings are attributed to Ed (the small letter as usual indicating the corrector). Whereupon, without looking at the text of Bekker or even of Hermann, Messrs Starkie and Mahaffy boldly observe 'All editors read' so and so! See notes on v. (3) l. 6 (68 D), *ib.* l. 12.

The following are the passages in which E agrees with the papyrus while B differs from both.

Bodl.

τε
κακῶν

ἀνθρωπείων
μετὰ τῶν θεῶν (punctis notavit b).
ἀλλὰ καὶ

φιλοσοφοῦντες
τοῦ σώματος ἀναπλέα

οὔτω δεῖν

harmony with some of Prof. Mahaffy's remarks in the introduction), that the conjectural emendations of modern scholars receive hardly any support from the papyrus. In the place referred to (82 E) Heindorf with characteristic acuteness had conjectured *τοῦ* for *τῶι* and this reading has been accepted by Schanz. The alteration is a slight one and improves the sense. Our editors declare that this emendation (and this alone) is supported by the papyrus and have transcribed accordingly. But their view is not borne out by the facsimile. Let any one compare the last three letters of the line in question with *τον* at the end of l. 7 for example,

and the difference is manifest. On the other hand the letters, blurred as they seem and injured by a flaw in the papyrus, have a sufficiently near resemblance to the $\tau\omega\iota$ of v. (2) l. 2, vi. (3) l. 3, vii. (4) l. 4.

See also the $\omega\iota$ of $\phi\acute{o}\beta\varphi$ in vi. (5) l. 3.

There is however one place in which a former conjecture of C. F. Hermann's is

67 E $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\iota$ του] του

Ib. οὐ γελοῖον (required to fill the line)

68 D καὶ δέει

69 A ἄλλων before ἡδονῶν

Ib. Σιμμία (required to fill the line)

Ib. πρὸς ἀρετὴν

80 E ραιδίως

81 A διάγουσα

81 B ὑπὸ [τε] τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν καὶ ἡδονῶν

81 C ψυχὴν before αὐτὴν

82 C ἄλλω ἢ (ἄλλ' ἢ B) τῷ φιλομαθεῖ

83 A οὕτω παραλαβοῦσα ἡ φιλοσοφία
ἔχουσαν

83 B ἡ λυπηθῇ ἡ φοβηθῇ

Ib. ἀπ' αὐτῶν

83 C μάλιστα ὁρατὰ

(not quite certain)

84 A παραδιδόται

Ib. μεταχειριζομένης

Thus in one instance only out of the nineteen selected by Schanz, or in two at most, has any scholar anticipated the readings here discovered, and in the only certain instance, the excision of words supplement-

confirmed, viz. the rejection of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}$ φασιν in viii. (4) l. 13 (83 E). This may be placed to his credit though he afterwards departed from it. But the papyrus fails to support the following conjectures which Schanz, the best of recent editors, thinks worthy of notice, and some of which he adopts, perhaps rightly.

$\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\iota$ cj. Hirschig.

bracketed by Schanz.

καὶ δειλία cj. Wagner.

om. Cobet (with Iamblichus).

deleted by Naber.

bracketed by Ast: other readings suggested by Geddes, Hartog, and Wyttenbach.

bracketed by Hirschig.

διαγούση cj. Heindorf.

deleted by Vermehren.

bracketed by Hirschig.

suspected as a gloss by Beck and Rückert, variously emended by Heindorf, Wyttenbach, Wagner and the Zurich editors.

οὕτως ἔχουσιν παραλαβοῦσα ἡ φιλοσοφία
Hirschig.

ἡ φοβηθῇ Schanz.

ὑπ' αὐτῶν cj. Heindorf and so Schanz prints.

μάλιστα τὰ ὁρατὰ cj. Heindorf (adopted by Schanz).

deleted by Madvig.

Vermehren cj. μεταχειριζομένης, while Schanz prefers μεταχειριζομένην, the reading of E.

ing an ellipsis, the conjecture was withdrawn by the conjecturer in favour of another! Surely it is needless to point the moral.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

(To be continued.)

THE LIBRARY OF J. G. GRAEVIUS.

UPON the death of J. G. Graevius in 1703 a catalogue of his famous library was drawn up by his heirs, preparatory to its being offered for sale by auction—*'tempus...quo publice distraherentur libri, cum nondum convenerit, ab Haeredibus per Ephemerides publicas significabitur.'* No public sale however took place since the whole collection was disposed of by private contract to the Elector Johann NO. XLV. VOL. V.

Wilhelm who gave for it 6000 Reichsthalers.¹ He presented the printed books to the University of Heidelberg, of which he was a munificent patron, and which, after the spoliation of the Palatine library by Tilly, was sadly in need of such a bequest. He

¹ Wundt, *Geschichte der Stadt Heidelberg* l. p. 370. I owe this and several other references to Professor Zangemeister.

retained however the MSS., 119 in number, together with the presentation copies of the editions *in usum Delphini* sent to Graevius by the King of France. These were placed in his own library at Düsseldorf under the same roof with his picture gallery and cabinet of coins. A traveller in the year 1711 has left his description of a visit to the Düsseldorf collections which is of great interest.¹ He says 'Die Bibliothek von Grävius macht das beste aus, welche ganz all hier geblieben, bis auf die *Litteratores*, so der Churfürst der Universität Heidelberg gegeben. Unter den wenigen MSS. so mir gezeigt werden war das vornehmste ein schöner alter *Codex* in 4° von *Horatio*, welchen Grävius Herrn Bentley gelehnt, der ihn auch lange nicht restituiren wollen, bis man ihn gedrohet der Churfürst wurde desfalls an die Königin schreiben. Verschiedene Bände von *Epistolis authographis eruditissimorum virorum* so Grävius gesammelt. Etliche sehr zierliche *Breviaria*, darunter war eines in duodez. mit Silber beschlagen in welchen so viele und schöne Mignatur Figuren als ich jemalen in dergleichen gesehen. Herr le Roy zeigte mir auch die *Officia Ciceronis* durch Scheffer 1466 gedruckt: es waren die Bücher *de Amicitia et Senectute* manu recentissima dazu geschrieben. Als ich mich in der Bibliothek umgesehen, führte mich Herr le Roy nochmalen zu den Münz-Cabinet, und zeigte mir noch ein und anders,' etc.

It has for some time been known that several MSS. of Graevius, including the Horace here mentioned, were in the Harleian collection, and that they were bought from John James Zamboni, the Resident for the Landgraf of Hesse-Darmstadt at the British Court. Nothing however further was known as to the source from which Zamboni procured his MSS. until Mr. Peterson recently drew attention to his correspondence preserved in the Bodleian Library and showed that several of them, and notably the Quintilian [Harl. 2664], were bought from Büchels, the librarian to the Elector at Düsseldorf. He does not however inquire into the sources from which Büchels drew, nor does he apparently use the volume containing the letters of Büchels,² in which fuller information is given than in those written to him by Zamboni. Upon examining the correspondence, in which I was greatly interested, it soon became obvious to me that Büchels was engaged in selling to his client the whole of the *codices Graeviani*,

the majority of which I have now identified as being in the British Museum. In view of the great importance of many of these MSS., which comprise some of the most valuable in the Harleian collection, I make this further contribution towards their past history.

Büchels was brought to the notice of Zamboni by a person named Berenstadt, who had bought a number of books from him—'ledit sieur B. a eu ses plus beaux livres de ma Bibliothèque'—and also was accustomed to visit Düsseldorf, since he gave Zamboni a particular description of certain books afterwards bought from Büchels, e.g. the Acts of the Council of Bâle [Harl. 3972]. The first letter of Büchels is dated Aug. 31, 1717. In it he speaks of his 'Bibliothèque naissante' which he has no intention of spoiling. On the contrary he wishes to add to it. For some time he supplied Zamboni with rare printed books, which he professes to get from various monasteries, and describes the difficulties he has to meet in consequence of the unwillingness of the monks to part with their treasures—'il y a des moines si entêtés qui ne les laisseront pas suivre, quoy qu'on leur en donnerat deux fois autant qu'ils ne vailent.' Also there are English dealers going about who raise the price of everything. The letters of Zamboni to him are not preserved before November¹¹, 1721. Although it was not until two years later that any considerable list of MSS. is given, they now begin to be mentioned. The first reference is to a Horace of which he says 'l'Horace MS. est selon Mabillon du IX^e siècle,' and which must be the '*Graevii primus*' afterwards sold, which was as we know one of the show-books belonging to the Elector. Soon after he says 'il y a un de mes amis qui m'écrsit d'avoir un beau Salluste in 8° du siècle XII et un Terence admirable in 4° du siècle IX.' The latter is probably the MS. of Graevius [G. 4]. He then mentions the Quintilian [Harl. 2664], and the particular edition of the *De Officiis* described by Uffenbach as existing in the Elector's library—'il y a au voisinage un autre Cicéron imprimé avec cette inscription ...ann. 1466, il y a un MS. du même Cicéron y joint de vera amicitia sive Laelius et de Senectute.' This with an edition of the previous year were bought by Zamboni but I have not been able to trace then further. In Dec. 1723 a considerable list of MSS. is given. His expressions are guarded but imply that the MSS. were not then at Düsseldorf, and that he was not thoroughly acquainted with their contents until after

¹ Uffenbach, *Gelehrte Reisen*, iii. p. 740.

² Rawl. Lett. 126.

further examination. He says, 'vous trouverez icy une liste de MSS. à vendre...celui qui possède ces MSS....j'ay veu chez le mesme amy...il y a encore plusieurs MSS. et n'ayant pas eu du loisir assez pour les examiner vous en serez informé par ma première.' After this catalogues succeed each other with rapidity, many of the books figuring in more than one since Zamboni pretended to have lost the previous list. Büchels wished to sell them altogether—'les ayant acheté en corps je ne les puis separer,' while Zamboni preferred to pick and choose. The Horace was originally sent to him for inspection, and he affected to think very little of it; then a fragment of Horace [Harl. 2688]. Finally however he bought everything by a series of purchases. The first consisted of 11 MSS. [March 20, 1723], comprising the famous Vitruvius, the second of 13 others among which is the *Graevii primus* for the *De Officiis* [Harl. 2716], the third was the largest, including all that was left. He says, 'j'ay pris la resolution de vous acheter le tout pour 1600 florins courans d'Hollande.' This was to include the collection of autograph letters which Uffenbach mentions as belonging to the Elector, and which are now in the possession of the 'friend' of Büchels—'il a aussi un beau recueil des lettres autographes...il les veut abandonner à vostre service à condition que vous luy en donnez 60 louis d'or.' Several other minor purchases took place, one comprising three MSS. of which Zamboni had been informed by Berenstadt, *sc.* the Acts of the Council of Bâle [Harl. 3972], and two beautiful Gospels [Harl. 2795, 2820]. Of these books Büchels speaks with enthusiasm. 'Ce sont trois pièces dont je ne me voulois defaire....l'un est écrit avec des lettres d'or et de vermillon partout, lequel est plus ancien, l'autre temoigne son antiquité par la relieure et couverture sur laquelle il y a une pièce d'yvoire enchassée avec les quatre animaux ou figures representantes les quatre evangelistes....Ces livres sont l'ornement de ma Bibliothèque.' This last is possibly the book which excited the admiration of Uffenbach, though it must be mentioned that he says it was in 12°, whereas this is in 4°. Here Büchels speaks of them as being part of 'his' library; elsewhere they belong to his friend—'ayant persuadé mon amy de vous laisser les trois MSS. specifiez pour la deuxième negotiation.' Other books of peculiar value were a *Speculum Saxonicum*, or collection of the old laws of Saxony, and the 'Prayers of King Suleiman,' a Turkish book which fell into the possession of the

Elector of the day when the siege of Vienna was raised and afterwards belonged to Gustavus Adolphus. Of this he says, 'celui qui l'a le veut envoyer à sa majesté Imperiale ou au prince Eugène s'il ne trouve personne qui le paye à poid d'or,' words which would suggest that the Elector was the seller.

Zamboni meanwhile lost no time in selling the books, which were with a few exceptions bought by Lord Oxford. From Wanley's diary we know that three purchases took place, one on August 6, 1724, the second—comprising three MSS. only, *sc.* the Acts of the Council of Bâle and the two Gospels—on August 28 of the same year; and the third which was the most extensive one upon October 20, 1725. There is a letter of Zamboni dated April 10, 1725, to a friend at Vienna, Baron Palm, in which he speaks of the beauty and value of the 32 MSS. he had then received, and offers to sell them all for 500 guineas. At present they had only been seen by Mr. Maittaire, but if Palm will not buy them he will show them to Lord Oxford or the Duke of Devonshire. Palm promised that the Emperor should see the list, but no purchase seems to have resulted. As chests from Büchels continued to arrive the number of MSS. bought by Harley was considerably greater.

The trade was now broken off in consequence of the rascality of Zamboni. He had contracted to pay 1600 florins by four instalments, but the bills he gave were never met. One of them was cancelled by Büchels in consideration of monies disbursed by Zamboni for a connection of his who was concerned in a law-suit at London. Zamboni, who was a speculator and a man of pleasure, was chronically impecunious, and neither the entreaties nor threats of Büchels to the end of his days ever extracted anything from him except promises to pay.

This perfidy prevented a new purchase from a person who is now mentioned for the first time, *sc.* 'la fille de feu M. Graevius,' who is willing to sell letters belonging to her father for a fine watch (une belle montre Anglaise). Afterwards she wishes to part with all the relics of the scholar for 700 florins, *sc.* a vast collection of letters, a few MSS. still left, and a quantity of MSS. notes by him and other famous persons. These were all sent to Büchels and he claims to have spent the whole winter of 1724—5 in arranging them. A final catalogue was produced on May 25, 1725, in which the letters, 4696 in number, are classified under the nationalities of their respective writers. The

unhappy Büchels, who was well-nigh frantic at his inability to get any money out of Zamboni for the MSS., could not go on with the negotiation. At last however in December 1726 Zamboni condescends to offer £60 for the whole collection to the heirs of 'Mademoiselle Graevius,' she having died in the meantime, and it was sent off to the agents of Büchels in London, where, as the money was not forthcoming, it remained. The correspondence was then broken off until March 1732 when Büchels was surprised by a letter from Zamboni, who proposes to renew the commerce. I quote a portion of his reply.

'Il est bien ridicule d'avancer que nos comptes seraient finies il y a long temps, si j'eusse continué d'être en commerce avec vous. Comment continuer un commerce, quand on ne paye pas? Vostre commerce m'a ruiné, j'emploie mon peu de bien sur vostre parole pour vostre avantage, vous en donnez vos obligations et ne les retirez pas après mille promesses, et cela depuis neuf ans, il faudroit être insensé pour continuer un tel commerce.... Vous vous souvenez bien que c'est à vos ordres que j'ay envoyé la caisse avec les lettres et MSS. à Londres... j'en ay contentée la demoiselle Graevius, croyez vous, Monsieur, que cela me fait du plaisir?... que dit on d'un homme qui demeure toujours dans nos dettes et qui nous ne fait pas justice quoy qu'il en ait fait cent fois l'assurance et la promesse? Je me serviray de l'expression qui vous me suggerez... je vous jure qu'en cas que vous me contenterez je vous donneray une attestation écrite en lettre d'or, laquelle vous pourrez mettre *ad valvas Basilicae S. Pauli* que vous êtes le plus honnête homme du monde.'

However he gave Zamboni permission to withdraw the chest of letters from his agents. What became of them I cannot say. Dr. Meade is said to have had 2300 letters of Graevius, which may have come from this source.

Büchels was entrusted by the Elector with the task of moving his library to Heidelberg. His last letter from Düsseldorf is dated June 13 1732, from July 22 1732 to March 10 1733 he writes from Mannheim, from May 29 1733 to April 6 1735 he is at Heidelberg. Writing from Mannheim he says, 'je partiray peut-être lundi prochain pour Heidelberg où je mettray la Bibliothèque Electorale à l'air, dont elle a besoin ayant été empaquetée depuis un an, et ayant été mouillée dans le bateau, selon le rapport de quelques uns, lors qu'elle fut emmenée icy de Düsseldorf.' The rest of

his life he spent at Heidelberg, where he was employed in arranging the Elector's library. He was broken down by disease and family misfortunes, and his last letter is that of a man on the point of death. The final blow was that he had just been forced to pay another daughter of Graevius 12 louis—'pour la contenter de ce que je lui devais encor à l'égard des MSS. de son père,' so that nothing was now left to pay for his burial.

Büchels was a man of some cultivation. He wrote Latin verses of average merit, and possessed great bibliographical knowledge. His letters are extremely well written, and sound like those of an honest man. There are, it is true, indications that he did not always distinguish between what was his and what belonged to his master. Thus in one of his later letters he says quite simply 'j'ay trouvé un livre dans la Bibliothèque Electorale,' which apparently he offers for sale. There is a suggestive discrepancy as to the source from which *La Clavicule de Salomon* [Harl. 3536] comes. This he originally professed to have recently got from Würzburg, but in another letter he says apparently of the same MS, 'feu S. A. Electorale mon maistre en a donné mille florins à un Anglois qui se nomma icy le Seigneur de Saint Pol.' It is however scarcely credible that he would have ventured upon so bold a theft as that of the chief literary treasures of the Düsseldorf collection, including the show-books exhibited to visitors. He further offered for 400 florins in 1725 a collection of coins, 319 in number, of which he says 'il y a icy un recueil des grands Medaillons.' This is undoubtedly the Electoral collection seen by Uffenbach. I should conjecture that the bulk of the books had been removed from Düsseldorf to some other seat of the Elector, and were sent back by instalments to be secretly sold through Büchels. The latter says of a particular MS. [Harl. 3298] 'j'ay veu il n'y a pas longtemps un MS... si vous souhaitez, je tascheray de l'arracher de la prison où il est.' The mysterious friend is sometimes said to be travelling—'tout y est hormis les lettres originelles que mon amy a encor chez luy et qui est en voyage'—or to live in the country—'je l'iray trouver dans deux ou trois jours puis qu'il demeure a la campagne et je tascheray de l'avoir.' On the other hand it is puzzling that Zamboni should have ventured to take liberties with so powerful a client, and also that Büchels never throws off the veil or declares himself to be merely an agent. The only occasion on which he threatens to call in intervention is in his last letter but one where he says he

will complain to the Secretary of the Landgraf, whom he knows.

That Zamboni knew the previous history of the MSS. he bought is obvious. He was also in correspondence with M. Karsch, the keeper of the Düsseldorf picture gallery, with whom he did a trade in works of art, and who found him an equally unsatisfactory paymaster. Further his friend Berenstadt had visited Düsseldorf and sent him a description of books in the possession of Büchels. Also, although Büchels nowhere says that the MSS. had belonged to Graevius, we know from Wanley's diary that Zamboni informed him Graevius had been the owner of them. Further Zamboni possessed a catalogue of Graevius MSS. which he lent to Wanley after the purchase, to help him in arranging them. Now, if Zamboni knew the MSS. had belonged to Graevius, he must have been aware that they had passed after his death into the library of the Elector.

The first purchase made by Lord Harley took place upon August 6, 1724. Wanley gives a list of the books in his diary, and there is entered upon the first leaf of each the date of purchase. I add a list of them as they occur in the Harleian catalogue. Some of them do not appear to come from Büchels and are probably, as Zamboni said, Italian MSS. These I have asterisked. In the case of MSS. formerly belonging to Graevius I have added the number given to the MS. in his posthumous Catalogue. The dates are the revised ones furnished by Mr. Maunde Thompson.

(1) Harl. 1275. Jac. de Cessulis de moribus hominum et officiis nobilium super Ludum Scaccorum.

(2) Harl. 2470. Tullii Epistolae familiares. xv³/₈ cent. [G. xi], the *Graevii* sec. bought by him at Amsterdam.

(3) Harl. 2559. Boetius de Consolatione Philosophiae, has curious verses in praise of Otho iii. (Emperor of Byzantium 984-1002 A.D.).

(4) Harl. 2664. Quintilian [G. 7] x/xi cent. borrowed by Graevius from Cologne Cathedral. *v. infra*.

(5) Harl. 2688. Fragmentum Prisciani [G. 27]—fragmentum Horatii [G. 30] x cent.—Ventorum Schema—Hymni in Dedicatione Ecclesiae S. Michaelis—fragmentum Onomastici Graeco-Lat. These were bound together by Wanley.

(6) Harl. 2767. Vitruvius [G. 9] ix/x cent. lent by Graevius to Bigotius (Burmann Syll. Ep. iv. pp. 477, 478), and collated throughout by Müller-Strübing for Val. Rose.

(7) Harl. 2770. Virgilio Aeneis cum scholiis [G. 18] cent. xii.

(8) Harl. 3303. Dialogus Aeneae Sylvii.

(9) Harl. 3318. Βαβυλωνικῆς εἰδωλομανίας ἱστογραφία, a poem of Melancthon, bound up by Wanley with a number of other works, also bought from Zamboni.

(10) Harl. 3534. Horatius, cent. xii.

(11) Harl. 3722. Francisci Petrarchae Africa.

*(12) Harl. 3871. Tullii Rhetorica vet. et nova—De Inventione Synonyma—Gasparini Pergamensis exordia circa Rhetoricam novam Ciceronis—Praecepta Gasparini de Parma.

*(13) Harl. 3872. Valerius Maximus—Sallustius—Arator Subdiaconus—Prudentius—Juvenalis—Tullii Paradoxa—De Amicitia ann. 1377—Incerti poema de Ulfo et Alda—Tullius de Senectute—Sedulii Carmen Paschale.

*(14) Harl. 3975. Obsidio et Interceptio urbis Sylvae Ducensis sub Grobendeckio, ann. 1629.

*(15) Harl. 4481. Histoire de l'Empereur Charles V.—Traicté des Comtes de Flandres et d'Arthois.

(16) Harl. 5637. Variae lectiones in Polyaenum. [G. 110.]

(17) Harl. 7011. Melanethonis Notae in Jeremiam [G. 68 'ipsius manu'], bound by Wanley with a number of letters.

One book bought on this occasion, *Eusebii Historia Eccles. Latine per Rufinum, is missing from the Harleian Catalogue.

The second purchase was made on August 28, 1724, and consisted of

(1) Harl. 2795. Evangelia IV. etc.

(2) Harl. 2820. Evangelia IV. etc.

(3) Harl. 3972. Concilii Basiensis Decreta et Gesta ['authentiqué par Michael Gualteri secret. du dit Concile,' Büch.].

The final purchase of October 20, 1725, included the bulk of Zamboni's acquisitions. Wanley made a list of them 'on a loose paper' which is lost: but notes that he entered the date October 20, 1725, in all of them. By a comparison of the lists given by Büchels with the Harleian Catalogue I have been able to identify the following MSS. as bought on this occasion, the identification being in all cases fixed by the dates entered in Wanley's hand upon the first page. In the absence of the 'loose paper' the list cannot claim to include everything.

(1) Harl. 2511. Cic. de Natura Deorum—de Divinatione—Timaes. [G. 38] cent. xv³/₈. On first page is the name of a former owner, H. Slingsby.

(2) Harl. 2512. Cic. Epp. ad Familiares

[G. 12]. This I find is the 'Mentelianus' of Graevius; sent to him by D. Elzevir from the library of J. Mentel the physician, of Paris, d. 1671. The book has in it the label of another possessor, *Johannis Baptistae Mazairt*.

(3) Harl. 2528. Valerius Probus—Fabius Victor. A beautiful MS. written in gold, ultra-marine and carmine.

(4) Harl. 2568. Asconius Pedianus in Cic. orationes, and various other works [G. 55].

(5) Harl. 2584. Solinus—Aristotelis Problemata *Latine ex versione Theod. Gazae*—ib. de secretis secretorum [G. 49] '*Ex domo St. Albani ordinis Carthusianorum prope Treviros*,' Büch.

(6) Harl. 2610. Ovidii metamorphoses I—III [G. 28], cent. x/xi—Papiae vocabularii fragmentum [G. 34] originally anonymous, '*imo est pars Papiae*' is written on first page in hand of Graevius.—Chalcidii Timaeus [G. 25].

(7) Harl. 2682. Cic. Epp. ad Fam. I—XVI etc. [G. 2] cent. xi. This MS. is the Coloniensis Basilicanus or Hittorpianus, originally belonging to Cologne Cathedral, and there used by Modius and Gulielmus. It was borrowed by Graevius. A collation of the valuable parts of this MS., together with a discussion of the principal readings by myself, will shortly appear in the *Anecdota* series of the Clarendon Press.

(8) Harl. 2685. Boetius de Consolatione philosophiae—Fulgentii Mythologiae—id. de continentia Virgiliana—Marc. Capella de nuptiis Philologiae [G. 5]. On the first page is written *Liber Mai. EK.*, probably referring to Cologne Cathedral. *v. infra*.

(9) Harl. 2688. Luitprandi Crem. epi. Rerum per Europam gestarum [G. 24], bound up by Wanley with a number of purchases made from Zamboni on August 6 (except Boetius de Musica, which comes from a different source).

(10) Harl. 2709. Ovidii Heroides [G. 43] cent. xiii.

(11) Harl. 2713. Isidori Hispaliensis Etym. lib. 1, cent. ix/x.—Commentarius in incerti cuiusdam Grammaticam—Boetii in Porphyrii Isagogen, cent. xii. [G. 42?].

(12) Harl. 2716. Cic. in Catilinam [G. 26] cent. x/xi, the *Graevii primus*.—De Officiis [G. 21] cent. xi, the *Graevii primus*. He has written on the first page *est codex optimus et praestantissimus*. It has been recently collated by A. Luchs.—Various fragments of the pro Marcello, pro Ligario and de Senectute, cent. xi.

(13) Harl. 2725. Horatius cent. x, the

Graevii primus, bought by him in a shop at Cologne [Bentleii Epistolae ed. Friedemann p. 115]. It is omitted in his catalogue, being in the possession of Bentley at the time of his death.

(14) Harl. 2772. Virgilio Aeneidos fragmenta [G. 18]—Juvenalis fragm. [G. 19]—Sedulii Operis Paschalis I—III. [G. 40]—Macrobbii de somnio Scipionis fragm. [G. 23]—Fragm. Interpretis in Juv. [G. 31]—Fragm. Periphraseos in Juv. [G. 32], all of the twelfth century except the Virgil fragment, which is of the eleventh.

(15) Harl. 2773. Servii Grammat. Vocab. Lat.—Graecum.—Diomedis Grammatica [G. 17]—Cic. Epp. ad Fam. I—VIII. [G. 17], the *Graevii primus*, collated by Mr. Purser—Satira in Johannem Papam, cent. xiii. The Servius has on the first page a partially effaced inscription, *iste liber est Hospitalis S. Nicolai prope Cusam*. It was probably bound up with the other works by Wanley. Graevius bought the Cicero at Cologne.

(16) Harl. 3034. Etymologia ex Isidoro de Ecclesia—S. Augustini Enchiridion—Praedicatio de Natali Domini [G. 3].

(17) Harl. 3060. S. Patrum Sententiae—Juliani Toletani Episcopi de origine mortis etc.—S. Ephraem orationes [G. 15].

(18) Harl. 3082. Boetii de Trinitate—an Pater Filius et spiritus Sanctus substantialiter praedicentur—Quod Substantiae eo quod sunt bonae sunt—Adversus Eutichen et Nestorium [G. 13].

(19) Harl. 3121. Aratoris Subdiaconi Historia Apostolica, *carm. heroico*.

(20) Harl. 3298. Chrysostomi homiliae in Ev. S. Johannis in Lat. linguam versae a Burgundione indice *ann.* 1178. [G. 6]. Graevius has written a learned note upon the author Burgundius on the first page.

(21) Harl. 3318. Various works including J. Scaligeri Castigationes variae [G. 112], and J. Meursii de Porphyrio Syntagma said to be '*manu Meursii*' in the Catalogue of Graevius [G. 96], all bought on October 20, exc. art. i.

(22) Harl. 3336. Meditata et dictata ad Synopsin Besoldi [G. 107].

(23) Harl. 3339. Notulae in Horatium, Arnobium, Petronium, ascribed to J. M. Dilher of Jena by Wanley. Only the notes on Horace however are in his hand.

(24) Harl. 3342. Petri Scriverii excerpta et carmina [G. 99], in his own hand, according to catalogue of Graevius.

(25) Harl. 3381. De imperio ac subjectione civili [G. 88].

(26) Harl. 3382. $\Lambda\epsilon\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ τοῦ βασιλέως

OPNEOSΘOΦION ἡτοί (sic) περὶ Ἱεράκων [G. 87].

(27) Harl. 3417. Petri Scriverii et aliorum notae in Juvenalem, Senecam, Ovidium, Martialem, A. Gellium, Lucanum, etc.

(28) Harl. 3419. Index in Petronium—Emendationum in Petronium Sylva *alia manu*. On f. 28 b. is written the name Philip Leydensis.

(29) Harl. 3420. Groschedelii Dispositio numerorum Magica—said to have come from Würzburg by Büchels.

(30) Harl. 3470. De re militari populi Romani, possibly in hand of Graevius [G. 71].

(31) Harl. 3520.—2. Ovidii Amorum libri ex ed. Plaut. 1567 cum MS. D. Moreti per J. Rubens collati [G. 66], bound up with other tracts by Wanley.

(32) Harl. 3521. Adversaria et excerpta Scaligeri et aliorum. Art. 5 and 7 seem in the hand of Dilher. The volume deserves examination.

(33) Harl. 3536, 1. La Clavicule de Salomon, oddly bound up with two Italian tracts [*v. supra* for source of this MS.].

(34) Harl. 3556. Columella de re rustica [G. 41].

(35) Harl. 3569, 4, 5. Danielis Eremitae Epitaphium—eiusdem Iter Germanicum. This MS. was sent to Graevius by Magliabecchi [Fabricius, Graevii Praefationes, etc. p. 223] and edited by him. Utrecht 1701. It is omitted in his Catalogue.

(36) Harl. 3574. Raccolta di tutte le Scritture politiche uscite tra Papalini e Francesi per le brighe occorse in Rom, ann. 1662, 1663.

(37) Harl. 3592. J. à Vitriaco Historia Hierosolymitana [G. 14?].

(38) Harl. 3595. Boethi Artis Arithmeticae libr. ii.—de Musica [G. 8]—Geometriae Euclidis libr. ii. [G. 54].

(39) Harl. 3837. Miscellanea and Excerpts from various scholars: attributed to Dilher in catalogue, but there are several hands in the MS. together with notes by Graevius, e.g. f. 81.

(40) Harl. 3982. Onosandri Strategica—Aeliani Tactica [G. 50].

(41) Harl. 3993. Collectanea de re militari.

(42) Harl. 4026. In Tullii orationes ed. 1539 Rob. Stephani variae lectiones. Büchels mentions a companion volume with variae lectiones to the Epp. ad Fam. in which Graevius had written 'hae sunt notae M. A. Mureti quas marg. ed. Rom. Stephani adscripserat quae nunc Romae servantur in collegio Societatis Jesu; has notas vero

describi iussit ex illo codice et Roma misit mihi J. G. Graevio Paulus Falconerius. [ep. Burmann Syll. Ep. IV. 494].

(43) Harl. 4086. Notae in Amphitryonem et Asinariam.

(44) Harl. 4346. Macer de uiribus Herbarum—tractatus de ponderibus. On first page is written *sum Francisci Wolffs medici*.

(45) Harl. 4739. J. F. Gronovii dictata ad Petronium.

(46) Harl. 4803. Historia Provinciae Paraquariae.

(47) Harl. 5232. Annotationes in priscorum Apophthegmata [G. 90].

(48) Harl. 5364. Variae lectiones in Martialis Epigrammata. [G. 104?] with note *fuit mihi donatus a Weidnero*.

(49) Harl. 5377. Miscellanea Conringii Graevii et aliorum quorundam. Art. 15 is in hand of Dilher.

(50) Harl. 5379. J. Graevii ad Pomponium Melam dictata.

(51) Harl. 5379. Notae ad Cic. Epp. ad Fam.—ad Petronium—ad Pollucem, with notes of Graevius *in marg.*

(52) Harl. 5380. Notae in Dialogum Simocati—ad Alciphronem—in imagines Philostrati [G. 63].

(53) Harl. 5384. J. Meursii Theophrastus—Lectiones Theophrasteae [G. 82].

(54) Harl. 5385. Notae in Taciti Annales.

(55) Harl. 5590. 'Εὐσέβιος εἰς ἐπιγραφὰς τῶν Ψαλμῶν' [G. 100].

(56) Harl. 5610. 'Διονυσίου Σοφίστου ἐπιστολαί' etc. [G. 59].

(57) Harl. 5645. 'Θεμιστίου φιλοσόφου λόγοι' [G. 58].

(58) Harl. 5659. 'Μουσαίου τὰ καθ' Ἡρῶ καὶ Λέανδρον.' [G. 57].

(59) Harl. 5739. 'Συνεσίον ἐπισκόπου Κυρηναίου κατάστασις' [G. 67]. The catalogue of Graevius and Büchels add 'Διοκλέους ἐπιστολὴ προφυλακτικὴ πρὸς Αντίγονον βασιλέα,' but this is now missing.

(60) Harl. 5795. 'Τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰαμβλίχου εἰς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν Πορφυρίου—Ἀβαμώνος διδασκάλου πρὸς τὴν Πορφύριον πρὸς Ἀνεβῶ ἐπιστολὴν καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ ἀπορημάτων λύσις' [G. 36]. The Latin version of title of latter is in hand of Graevius.

(61) Harl. 6059. Lectiones in Florum [G. 117].

(62) Harl. 6296. 'Πορφυρίου φιλοσόφου περὶ ἀποχῆς ἐμψυχῶν' [G. 95].

(63) Harl. 6316. 'Ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἱστοριῶν Φιλοστοργίου ἐπιτομὴ ἀπὸ φωνῆς Φωτίου πατριάρχου—Ἐκλογαὶ Θεοδώρου' [G. 35].

(64) Harl. 6309. 'Απολλοδώρου πολιορκητικά'—J. Meursii Apollodorus [G. 60].

The above list comprises nearly all the important MSS. which occur in the catalogue of Graevius. The only valuable Greek MS. missing is the Hesiod [G. 56] of which Wanley notes that it was not among the MSS. bought, though he had seen it at Mr. Maittaire's. The latter was a great collector of Greek MSS. and may have kept the Hesiod. A similar case is that of the Apollonius and Galen [G. 52], which was certainly bought by Zamboni: to which may be added the 'Πλήθωνος Θεσσαλίας χωρογραφία' [G. 101]. The chief Latin MS. missing is the Terence [G. 4] mentioned by Büchels together with the Quintilian. One or two books look as if they ought to be the MSS. described by Büchels, but they have no date upon the first page, e.g. Harl. 3421, 'Viglii Fuichemi litterae ad amicos scriptae ab mense Jan. 1576 usque ad XXI Aprilis 1577,' with note 'obiit magnificus dñs praeses VII, Maii 1577' exactly corresponding to the description given by Büchels. Three of Zamboni's books Harley declined to buy as being too dear. These were the Prayers of Suleiman previously mentioned, the Speculum Saxonicum, and the two volumes of Letters from the Düsseldorf library. Wanley speaks of the 'most horrible price' that was demanded for these last by this 'greedy Signor,' and on September 27, 1725 enters his hope that all of these may come to him later for less, if rejected now. It is interesting to know that his forecast was verified, so far as the volumes of Letters were concerned. They are now Harl. 4933, 4934, 4935, 4936, being bound up in four volumes. Büchels gives a full list and description of the letters, which succeed each other in the same order in which they are now placed, except that according to his arrangement the second pair of volumes 4935, 4936 should come first. Also Wanley has bound up with them a few letters which do not come from Büchels, to which he alludes in his diary as being already in the Harleian collection. I cannot say when these volumes were bought as they contain no date.

I have reserved until now a special note upon the identification of the Quintilian [Harl. 2664] proposed by Mr. Peterson

(*Classical Review*, February 1891, p. 33). He calls it the missing *codex Dusseldorpianus* and interprets after Mr. Purser the words *iste liber est maioris ecclesiae* to mean that it originally belonged to Strasburg. That it is the MS. seen by Liebius at Düsseldorf and afterwards sought for in vain by Gesner who found '*mala fraude nescio quorum hominum et hunc et alios rarissimos codices esse subductos*' is indubitable. Its proper title however should be *cod. Coloniensis*. It is closely connected in the letters of Graevius with the Coloniensis Basilicanus [Harl. 2682], e.g. he says '*cathedralis, ut vocant, Ecclesiae bibliothecae inspicendae potestas nondum mihi facta est, in qua Quintiliani et Ciceronis orationum per vetustum codicem asservari audio*.'¹ The Cicero MS. was borrowed by him apparently in 1688,² and probably the Quintilian was obtained at the same time. Gulielmus, who was the chief collator of the Cicero, also consulted the Quintilian, of which he says '*usus sum per vetusto M. Fabii libro beneficio... Melchioris Hittorpii*' (Verisimil. iii. xiv). He gives there several readings and *proprii errores* of the MS. from the Preface to the sixth book, which are all found in the Harleian volume. Its identity with the MS. shown by Hittorp to Gulielmus is beyond a doubt. Further Cologne Cathedral is itself the *maior ecclesia*, a title which it has *passim* in old documents, e.g. in the *notae S. Petri Coloniensis* (Pertz. Mon. Germ. Hist. xvi. p. 734 etc.) we find '*cum de communi consilio diffinitum esset ut maior ecclesia de novo constitueretur... alii domini plures canonici maioris ecclesiae*' etc. This title would naturally be given to it, being, as Matthew of Paris says, '*omnium ecclesiarum quae sunt in Alemannia quasi mater et matrona*.' It is likely that the Boetius [Harl. 2685] comes from the same source. I must conclude by expressing my thanks to Professor Zangemeister of Heidelberg for valuable help and advice, and to Mr. Bickley of the British Museum, whose courtesy much facilitated the task of referring to the number of MSS. concerned.

¹ Burmann, *Sylloge Epistolarum*, iv. p. 151, cp. pp. 171, 174.

² Fabricius Graevii *Præf. et Ep.* p. 495.

LATIN ACCENTUATION.

THE information given by most School Grammarians about Latin Accentuation is very scanty. We seldom find anything more than the three elementary rules: (1) that the accent never falls on the last syllable of a Latin word, unless in the case of monosyllables; (2) that, when the penult is short, the accent falls on the antepenultimate syllable; when long, on the penult itself, e.g. *décōris*, *decōris*; (3) that certain particles *ve*, *que*, *ne* (interrogative) are enclitic.

But if we turn to the Latin Grammarians, we find much more information on this point. We hear of certain classes of words whose accentuation does not quite harmonize with these rules, as well as of a number of isolated words which form decided exceptions to them. For the study of Accentuation, introduced into Rome at the time of Cicero by Tyrannion, the author of the *περὶ προσφθιῶν*, long remained a favourite topic of Latin Grammarians; and one has only to turn over the pages of Keil's edition of their collected writings to see how great a store of materials was amassed by the labour of the five centuries' interval between Varro and Priscian. These materials, which have been extracted and arranged by Schoell in the *Acta Societatis Philologae Lipsiensis*, vol. vi. 1876, it is the object of the present paper to discuss, and with the help of the Early Latin Dramatists, and of the Romance Languages, to test and supplement.

At the outset it is necessary to say a word about the value of the Grammarians' evidence. Prof. Nettleship (*Transactions of Oxford Philological Society*, 1887-8) has shown the unreliable character of their statements about Latin Phonetics. He points out that the account they give of the functions of the vocal organs in pronouncing the several letters of the Latin alphabet is to a great extent borrowed from the writings of Greek phoneticians, and is really applicable to the pronunciation of the corresponding letters of the Greek alphabet. That there was a good deal of similar borrowing from Greek sources in the subject of Latin Accentuation may be regarded as certain. Indeed it is quite possible, and even probable, that one of the cardinal points of the Latin Grammarians' teaching with regard to Accentuation, viz. the distinction of the circumflex accent, e.g. *Rōma*, from the acute accent, e.g. *Rōmae*, may be a case of false analogy from the Greek

language; for though the distinction undoubtedly existed in Greek, no strong evidence has ever been produced of its existence in Latin. So that the safest plan, a plan which will be followed in the present paper, is to ignore the distinctive terms 'circumflex' and 'acute' altogether, in treating of Latin Accentuation, and to speak merely of the 'accent,' without specifying what kind of accent the Grammarians have declared it to be. On the other hand it would be unwise to regard all the statements of the Grammarians about the Latin Accent as tainted with Hellenizing influence, for we often find a sharp distinction made between the Greek and the Latin accentuation of similar words. Macrobius, for example (*exc. Bob.* p. 637 K.) contrasts the Greek treatment of simple verbs and their compounds with the Latin, the accent in Greek remaining always on the same syllable in both simple and compound, e.g. *φέρω*, *περιφέρω*, while in Latin it may be shifted to a different syllable, *féro*, *adfero*. So that though the Greek bias of Latin writers on Accent must be taken into consideration in weighing their evidence, it should only make us cautious, not utterly sceptical. Again the value of the Latin Grammarians' testimony differs greatly according to their date. A statement of Varro, Valerius Probus, or Quintilian has much more weight than a statement of one of the later grammarians, who often repeat blindly a wrongly understood dictum of an earlier writer. The treatise 'de Accentibus' by the pseudo-Priscian must be used with special caution, so much does it abound in mistakes and wrong-headed theories. The older and more celebrated Grammarians should therefore be almost exclusively followed in drawing up an account of Latin Accentuation.

It remains to determine what means we have at our disposal of testing the truth of the Grammarians' theories. We may look for help to two quarters, first to the verses of Plautus, Terence, and the Older Dramatists, second to the Romance Languages. But here too a word of caution is necessary in respect of both tests. That regard was taken of the Accentuation of words, as well as of their Quantity, by the Early Dramatists was one of the most strongly established propositions of Ritschl in his famous 'Prolegomena.' The theory has found many opponents, one of the most vigorous of

whom, W. Meyer, recently made a powerful statement of the extreme view that absolutely no regard whatever was taken of Accentuation in Latin Poetry till a late period (*Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie*, 1884). But Meyer's arguments were fully answered by Langen in the *Philologus* 1886, and have been so conclusively disproved by the new standard work on Early Latin Metre (Klotz, *Grundzüge der altrömischen Metrik*), that it may now be safely regarded as matter beyond argument that some regard at least was paid to Accent in Early Latin Dramatic Verse. Klotz has pointed out the curious fact that the Greek usage for the Iambic Trimeter, viz. that a spondee is not allowed in the even feet of the line, takes in the hands of the Latin Dramatists this modification that a spondee in which metrical ictus conflicts with natural accent is not allowed in these feet. The Iambic Trimeter was made up of three Dipodies. The important feet, the feet which gave the iambic rhythm to the line, were the concluding feet of each Dipody, in other words the even feet (second, fourth, sixth) of the line. To keep the line metrically correct the Greek Comedians never allowed these feet to be spondees.

Ὅσα δὲ δέδγγ | μαι τὴν ἔμην | τοῦ καρδίαν,
Aristoph. *Ach.* i

could not be changed to

Ὅσα δὲ λῦποῦ | μαι κ.τ.λ.

Their Roman imitators were unable, owing to the spondaic character of the Latin language, to follow them entirely in this scrupulous retention of the iambic rhythm of the line; but though they allow spondees in the even feet (second and fourth),

vos istaēc in | tro anferite, abi | te, Sosia.
Ter. *Andr.* I. i. i,

they almost never allow a spondaic word or word-ending in these feet, evidently because the clash of the natural accent with the metrical ictus would give unpleasant prominence to the un-iambic rhythm. A line like

quod si tu obici | as formicis | papaverem

is very rare in the Latin Drama. Klotz shows that the same rule is observed in Latin Trochaic lines in the metrically important feet of the Trochaic metre, the odd feet of the line.

That the Accent played a part in the Early Latin dramatic poetry which it did not in Greek poetry, may then be accepted as an established fact. It is however open

to question how far the versification of Plautus and Terence may be used as a means of determining the accentuation of a word or a phrase. The safest evidence is undoubtedly that afforded by Prosody. If a syllable, which would ordinarily be scanned long, be found in a line with a short quantity, this argues that the syllable was unaccented. I refer to such scansion as *volūptatem*, *volūptati*. The evidence of Metre is not so certain. It would be absurd to take the fact that the metrical ictus falls on a certain syllable of a particular word in a particular line of Plautus as a proof that the natural accent fell on the same syllable in the ordinary pronunciation of the word in Plautus' time—as absurd, in fact, as to suppose that metrical ictus and natural accent always coincide in English lines, or rather a good deal more absurd, seeing that English Metre depends on Accent, while Latin Metre depended on Quantity. But if we find the same word, or the same phrase, invariably used in Plautus with the metrical ictus on the same syllable, and that too when there is nothing in the prosodical nature of the word to prevent its occurrence with a different ictus, it is reasonable to suppose that the metrical ictus here reflects the ordinary accentuation. It must of course be remembered that the Accentuation so determined is that of the time of Plautus, and may differ from the Accentuation of the Classical period, just as in our own language many words, e.g. 'balcony,' have changed their accent in course of time.

Lastly, with regard to the Romance Languages, we may indeed, from the form which a Romance word has assumed, infer with some certainty the accentuation of its Vulgar Latin prototype; but we must bear in mind that this Vulgar Latin accentuation may have differed, and in some cases certainly did differ, from the accentuation in vogue in literary Latin.

And now that the ground has been cleared by the discussion of the nature of the evidence afforded by the Latin Grammarians, and of the means at our disposal for testing and supplementing it, we may proceed to examine in detail their statements on the subject of Latin Accentuation, with the exclusion only of such as appear to lack sufficient authority.

I. The rule of Latin Accentuation, that final syllables are always unaccented, is according to the Grammarians violated, or apparently violated, by certain classes of words. They are words which have dropt or contracted their last syllable, so that the

accent, which in the uncurtailed form fell on the penultima, remains in the curtailed form on the same syllable, which has now become the ultima.¹ Under this category come :

(1) Nouns, or rather Adjectives, in *-as*, Gen. *-atis*, indicating the country of one's birth, e.g. *cujás, nostrás, Arpinás*, with *primás, optimás* (Caper ap. Prisc. IV. 21, 22, p. 128 H.). These words, which in Early Latin (e.g. Plautus) have the full form *cuidátis, nostrátis*, when at a later time they became contracted, retained their old accentuation; and so *nostrás*, 'a countryman of ours,' was distinguished by its accent from *nostras*, Acc. Pl. Fem. of the Possessive Pronoun (Priscian IX. 5, p. 454 K.). Klotz (*Grundzüge* p. 92, p. 326) has suggested that Fem. Abstract Nouns in *-tas*, Gen. *-tatis*, may have been similarly accented on the last syllable in the time of Plautus, though we have the express testimony of the Grammarians that they were not so accented at a later time. He thinks that the metrical accentuation in such lines as Rud. 901 *tēpestás*, Rud. 1394 *libertás*, may represent the actual accentuation of these words in the speech of Plautus and his contemporaries. But a closer examination will show that Fem. Nouns in *-tas* have not the metrical ictus on the last syllable more frequently than other nouns in Plautus, and give no indication of having had a peculiar accentuation. It is true that the phrase *voluptás mea*, which shows this form always at the end of a line (Pseud. 52, Truc. 899, etc.), points to the accentuation of the last syllable of *voluptas* in this particular phrase. But the true explanation of this is that in this phrase the two words were regarded as one compound word, or, to state it somewhat differently, the Possessive Pronoun here was enclitic. Similarly we have *fratēr mi* Cure. 658, *matēr mea* Aul. 690, 692; but no one would think of using this as an argument that *frater* or *mater* were in all circumstances accented on the last syllable. In the middle of a line the order is *mēa voluptas*.

(2) Some Verbal Forms: *addíc, addúc*, etc., *fumát* (for *fumávit*), *audít* (for *audívit*), and the like. (Servius ad Aen. III. 3.)

Another remark of Servius (ad Aen. I. 451), and other grammarians, throws some light on the last example. They tell us that *audíit*, and not *audítit*, *leníit*, and not *lenítit*,

¹ Similarly in modern Italian we find the apocopated forms of words like *civiltatem, honestatem* pronounced with a strongly marked stress on the last syllable, *città, onestà*.

was the ordinary pronunciation, the forms with the short penult being an artificial usage of poetry, much as in English the word 'wind' is allowed a different pronunciation in poetry from its ordinary one. From *-íit* to *-it* is so short a step that it is difficult to justify a disbelief of the Grammarians' statement about *audít*. The Third Sing. Perf. Act. in the Romance languages (e.g. Ital. *comprò*, Latin *comparávit*, Ital. *dormì*, Latin *dormívit*) points to Vulgar Latin forms in *-áit, -it*. As regards Plautus, the supposed examples of *-at* for *avit* in his plays have been conclusively disproved by Fleckeisen (*Jahrb. Phil.* lxi. p. 60). Those of *-it* for *-ívit* have always the ictus on the last syllable, e.g.

Pseud. 730 *qui á patre advenit Carylto nécdum exit ex aédibus (exit A., exíit P.)*, and Poen. 203 *sed Adélphasium eccam exit atque Anterástylis*, where editors make *exit* Pres. and read *éxit eccam*, except Mil. 251 *nón domist, abít ámbulatum, dórmít, ornatúr, lavút (abít A., abíit P.)*, where, if *abít* be the true reading, it is probably Pres. like the other verbs in the sentence. The contractions *dínus* for *divínus*, *oblisci* for *oblivisci* in Plautus make *-it* for *-ívit* not improbable with him.

(3) Words ending in *-c* (the Enclitic *-ce*), whose last syllable is long by nature or by position, e.g. *adhác, posthác, antehác, istíc, illíc, istúc, illúc, istínc, illínc, istác, illác, istóc, illóc* (Caper ap. Priscian. IV. 21, 22 p. 128 H.). In Plautus and Terence the metrical accentuation of the first of these words seems to be always *adhác*, but we find both *posthác* and *pósthac*, *ant(e)hác* and *ánt(e)hac*. With regard to the forms of *ille* and *iste*, the Romance adverbs, e.g. Ital. *là, là*, Span. *allí, allá*, show that the Vulgar Latin accentuation was *illíc, illác*. That Plautus used *horúnc, harúnc*, but *hórum, hárum* before a word beginning with a consonant has been established beyond a doubt by Studemund (*Jahrb. Phil.* cxiii. p. 57), though this usage is often obscured by the MSS. In Pseud. 69, *harúnc voluptátum*, the Ambrosian Palimpsest alone has preserved the true reading *harunc*, while the Palatine MSS. have altered it into the more familiar *harum*. This habit of the scribes of Plautus MSS. of replacing an archaic by a classical form makes it difficult for us to determine his usage in respect of *illíc, istíc* and the like. For while in the time of Plautus *illi* or *illíc* might be used for the Dat. Sing. as well as for the Adverb (Loc. Sing.), in the classical period *illi* was restricted to the former, *illíc*

to the latter signification. In Capt. 261, where we have not the evidence of the Ambrosian Palimpsest to help us, it is quite possible that the Palatine MSS. have changed *illi* (Adverb) to the more familiar *illic*:

ut vos hic itidem illic apud vos meus servatur filius,

for the change to *illi* will not merely avoid conflict with what we conceive to have been the ordinary pronunciation, *illic*, but will also restore the usual accentuation, *apud vos*. The same restoration of *illi* for *illic* of the Palatine MSS. is required by the order of the words in Capt. 278:

quod genus illi est unum pollens atque honoratissimum,

where Schoell reads *illic unumst*.

(5) Words ending in *-n* (the Enclitic *-ne*), whose last syllable is long by nature or by position, e.g. *tantón*, *Pyrrhín*. (Servius ad Aen. X. 668 etc.)

Here again the MSS. of Plautus are uncertain guides, for they often add an interrogative *-n*, where the metre requires its absence, and *vice versa*. The lists compiled by Schrader, in his Dissertation on the use of *-ne* in Plautus, show about as many examples of the ictus on the last as on the penultimate syllable. But the shortening of the second syllable of *dedistín*, Trin. 127 (MSS. *dedisti*), (cf. *dedistíne* 129), *dédistín*, Curc. 345 (MSS. *dédisti*), if the reading could be depended on, would supply the corroboration of the Grammarians' theory, which we should expect to find in the versification of Plautus. Similarly, although it is a rule of Plautus that an Iambic Senarius shall not end with two iambic words, because the repeated conflict between natural accent and metrical ictus was displeasing to his ear, the ending of Most. 670, *bonán fide*, may have been tolerated on the ground that the ordinary pronunciation of the first word was *bonán*, not *bónan*. So also in Terence, Eun. 1037, *audín* occupies the fourth foot of an Iambic Octonarius, although the practice is, as we have seen, to allow a spondaic word only in the odd feet of Iambic lines, that there may not be in the even feet, the metrically important feet of the line, a conflict of natural with metrical accent. This conflict would be avoided if, as we have reason to believe, the ordinary accent was *audín*. The corresponding law for Trochaic verse required a similar harmony of accent and ictus in the odd feet of the line, the first feet, that is to say, of each Dipody. An apparent violation of this law at the beginning of Trin. 905, *nóvistín*, may be explained away in the same fashion. On

the other hand, in the case of Iambic words like *vides*, *habes*, which appear in Plautus and Terence with the last syllable short (*vidēs*, *habēs*), as well as long, it would be difficult to explain the shortening of the vowel in *vidén*, *habén*, if the words were invariably accented in ordinary talk on the last syllable *vidén*, *habén*.¹

II. This leads us to a new doctrine of the Grammarians, the Attraction of the Accent by Enclitics, *-que*, *-ve*, *-ne*, *-ce*. It is a matter in which the Latin Grammarians were undoubtedly liable to be unduly influenced by Greek analogy. And certainly the rule prescribed, probably after Varro, by Martianus Capella (iii. p. 67 Eyss.): 'mutant accentus adiunctis vocibus *que*, *ve*, *ne*,' bears a suspicious resemblance to the rule of Varro's teacher Tyrannion about the accentuation of *τοσσος γε* in Homer: 'Ἀριστάρχος φυλάσσει τὴν ὀξείαν ἐπὶ τῆς τοσ συλλαβῆς, ὃ δὲ Τυραννίων τοσσόςγε ἀνέγνω τὴν σος συλλαβὴν ὀξύνων (Schol. A. ad II. Ξ 396). But the usage of Plautus, as has been shown by Langen, in his Dissertation on the Latin Accent, and of other poets, confirms the rule of the Grammarians, that the Enclitic 'attracts' the Accent to the final syllables of words, if we restrict the rule to words whose final syllable is long by nature, or, when the Enclitic is added, by position, e.g. *tantóne*, *sanómine*, and perhaps also words which end in two or three short syllables, e.g. *limináque* (Servius ad Aen. III. 91); nor do the best Grammarians (Varro ap. Capell. iii. 67: Diomedes, p. 433 K.) seem to say more than this. Thus in Plautus and Terence the law against two iambic words following each other does not forbid *pudét pigétque*, Ter. Adelph. 302, apparently because there is a conflict between natural and metrical accent in the first word only. On the other hand such scansion as *vidétiqu(e)*, *licétn(e)*, *domí-ne* (from *domus*), show that the Accent was not invariably attracted by the Enclitic in these iambic words with final syllable long by nature, which, as we have already remarked, seem in ordinary pronunciation to have been as much pyrrhic (*dómí*) as iambic (*dómī*). *Mágisque* Rud. 1181, *príusne* Truc. 694, show the same of iambic words ending in *-s*, whose final syl-

¹ Cicero's story about Crassus (Div. II. 40) shows us that the phrase *cave ne eas* was pronounced in ordinary talk *cávē n(e)cas* with the second syllable of *cave* very short. He tells us that Crassus, when embarking at Brundisium for his ill-fated expedition to Parthia, heard a fig-seller hawking Caunian figs, and mistook his cry '*Cauneas! Cauneas!*' (sc. *ficus vendo*) for *cave ne eas! cave ne eas!*

lable ought by rule to be long by position; but we have many indications in the versification of Plautus that in his time *-s* had hardly the force of a final consonant, so that the actual pronunciation of these words was probably *māgī'que*, *prīū'ne*.¹ Words ending in two or three short syllables are not, according to Langen, found with an enclitic in Plautus or Terence, unless the enclitic is elided, e.g. *periculāqu(e)*, *Capuāqu(e)*. But disyllabic words ending in a short syllable show little trace of 'attraction' of accent, e.g. *itaque*, *ēaque*, *bōnaque*, *māleque*; and although in *hocine* etc. in Terence the accentuation *-cine* is found twice as often as *'cine*, in Plautus the two accentuations are equally frequent.

Instead of speaking of the Enclitic 'attracting', the Accent, it would then be truer to say that the Enclitic adds a syllable to the preceding word, and thus may necessitate an alteration in its Accent. The Accent of the first syllable of *aūdis* passes to the second syllable of *aūdisne* just as the Accent on the first syllable of *aestas* passes to the second syllable of *aestātis*. In *itaque*, *māleque*, etc., the Accent remains on the same syllable as in *ita*, *māle*, just as the Accent of *gēneris* is the same as that of *gēnus*. In words like *pericula*, *limina* a secondary accent is added when the long word becomes augmented by another syllable *periculāque*. The term 'Attraction' of Accent is unsuitable to the phenomena of the Latin Language, and, like the word 'Circumflex,' is a Greek term, properly applicable only to Greek phonetics, and wrongly transferred by the early Grammarians to the phonetics of Latin. *-ne*, *-que*, *-ve*, *-ce* merely add a

¹ The phrase *scelus viri*, a phrase we may be sure in everyday use on the streets of Rome, has always in the plays of Plautus this accentuation *scēllūs virī*; and this was no doubt the current pronunciation of the time.

syllable to the preceding word, as the Imperative particle *dum* in *excūtedum* Aul. 646, *ēvocādum* Most. 669, *āgedum* Bacch. 832, where the accent holds the same position as it would in an ordinary single word.

It is however possible that in later Latin there may have been an accentuation of words with *-que* etc., which more justifies the term 'Attraction.' Priscian (V. 63, p. 181 H.), tells us that *utrāque* (Fem. Nom. Sing.), *plerāque* (Fem. Nom. Sing.) had the same penultimate accent as *utrēque*, *plerāmque*. And late poets, such as Prudentius, lengthen a short final vowel before *-que*, e.g. *ridendāque*. But Priscian's accentuation may be either a late innovation, due to the analogy of *utrēque*, *plerāmque*, or a grammarian's conceit, like Donatus' distinction between *itāque*, 'and so,' and *itaque*, 'therefore,' a distinction which does not find the least support in the Dramatists' versification, (e.g. *itaque*, 'and so,' Truc. 347).² And Prudentius' scansion *ridendāque* may be the result of the late Latin pronunciation of *-qu-*, by which the velar guttural assumed the force of a double consonant. Comedian scans *āqua*, and in Modern Italian we have *acqua*.

On the whole the balance of probability is against the 'Attraction' of the Accent by Enclitics, at least in the classical and earlier period; but if we substitute the word 'alteration' for 'attraction,' the statements of the Grammarians about the influence of the Enclitics on the Accent may be accepted with slight reservations.

W. M. LINDSAY.

² Until the laws of Saturnian metre have been better established, it will be well to refrain from appealing to the accentuation of *itaque* in the Epitaph on Naevius:

itaque postquam est Orco traditus thesauro.

(To be continued.)

AMBULARE.

THE following etymologies have been proposed for this word: (1) *ambulus* = **ambibulus* connected with *venio* and the like (Curtius, *Gr. Et.*⁵ 473); (2) *ambulus* is formed directly from the preposition *ambi* (Bersu, *Die Gut-turalen*, 143); (3) Bugge (*Bezenbergers*

Beiträge xiv. 62) connects the word with *ἄγγελος*, Pers. *āγγapos*, *courier*, Skr. *āngira*; (4) Stowasser (*Dunkle Worte* 25) regards *ambulare* as a denominative from a borrowed word *ἀναβολή*. Of these etymologies the first and the third are phonetically im-

possible; *-bu-* can have nothing to do with *venio*, nor could *ng*, become anything but *ng* (cf. *unquentum*, Umbr. *umen*, Skr. *añjis*). Stowasser's suggestion is, to say the least, extremely improbable: there is no reason for believing that the word is a borrowed one, especially as it is also found in Umbrian. Nor does Bersu's etymology seem to me to be at all certain. Notwithstanding Bugge's remarks (*l.c.*) I am still inclined to think that Curtius and others were right in looking upon *ambulo* as a compound of *amb(i)* and a root meaning *to go*. A root *el* or *ol* with the sense of *to go* would meet the requirements of the case. Now a root *el-* (*ela*) with this signification is found in the Celtic languages;—Irish *ad-ellaim*, *go to*, *di-ellaim*=*deviare*, *declinare* etc. (Thurneysen, *Kelto-Romanisches* 34, Ascoli, *Lexicon Palaeo-Hibernicum* lv.), W. *elaf*, *I shall go*, *elvon*, *I went*, Corn. *ellen*, *I went* (*Grammatica Celtica*² 599 sq.). Thurneysen suggests hesitatingly that this verb *ellaim* is a compound of *ess*=*ex* and a stem *lā* seen in *rola*, *rula*, *dorala*, *venit*, but **esslaim* would have become *elaim*, a compound which is actually found in the sense of *escape*, and is referred to by Prof. Thurneysen himself. It is easier then to regard *ella* as a simple verb. At the same time it is not necessary to separate it from the stem *lā*; we may suppose a root *el-* or *ela*, *lā* like *τελα-τλā*,

κέρα-κρά-δεμνον, etc. (cf. *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* xxxi. 396 sq.), cf. also Ir. *rām*, *oar*, *rām*, *I row*, by the side of *ἔρμων* etc. If Thurneysen is right in identifying this intransitive *lā* with the transitive *lā* in the sense of 'bring, place, throw,' we might also perhaps compare *ἐλαίω*, *ἐλάσαι* stem *ela-*, though the meaning is somewhat different. In *ellaim* the second *l* will belong to some suffix; *ell* in Celtic is ambiguous, it seems to me most probable that we have a formation with an *n* suffix: *ellaim* might stand for **elnāmi*, with substitution of a strong form of the root for a weak as in Latin *consternāre* compared with **Skr. stñāmi*, and with the same change of conjugation.

As to the meaning of *ambulo*, it does not seem to be nearly so strongly opposed to the idea of composition with *ambi* as Bugge supposes. In *ambulo*, *walk about* (*sedeo* the preposition *ambi* is perfectly natural. With *ambulo*, *go on a journey*, *bene ambulato*, *bene ambula et redambula*, in expressing a wish for a pleasant journey, cf. Irish *imm-adall*, *a journey* (*imm*=*imb*, *ambi*), 'ni maith *im-madall* *indomnaich*, *it is not good to travel on Sunday* (Windisch, *Wörterbuch* 619), *imm-lai* *he goes away*, *goes off* (ib. 625). As to Umbrian *amboltu* (Bücheler, *Umbria* 93), it is not safe to dogmatise on the meaning and usage of a word which is found only once.

J. STRACHAN.

ON SOME LATIN AND GREEK NEGATIVE FORMS.

1. *Nōn* *noenu* *noenum*.

THE derivation of *nōn* from *noenu* *noenum* = *ne oinom*, adopted by Latin grammarians from Lachmann to Schweizer-Sidler and, so far as I know, questioned by none, might seem to have stood the test of time. But in spite of the fact that it is supported by the English *not* = *neought* and German *nein* = *ne ein*, it is open to serious objection.

The first objection is that *non* and *noenum* are employed side by side in Ennius, Plautus, Lucilius, Lucretius, and Varro. In the case of the last three *noenum* might indeed be an archaism. But there is no reason for supposing it to be so in Ennius and Plautus. Secondly, the compound *nolo* is found not only in Ennius, but also in the fragments of the XII. Tables. We shall therefore have to suppose a quite impossible contraction of **noinomvolo* to *nolo*, since *noinom* could scarcely have become *non* as early as the

fixing of the recorded text of the XII. Tables. The old derivation of *nolo* from *ne volo* (rejected by Corsen *Aussprache* &c. ii. 1027—8) is untenable because (1) we have no evidence that the *Italic* change of *ev* to *ov* was repeated in Latin and *neuter* as well as *nevolt* *nevis* &c. are against any such supposition, (2) granted a form *novolo*, we have no reason to suppose that it would become *nolo*: *Nola* for *Novla* is Oscan. Thirdly, the transition from *noinom* to *nōn* is phonologically impossible. The extremely doubtful *coraverunt* is scarcely evidence for *oi* becoming *ō*, and the dropping of the termination is unexplained.

I propose, therefore, to derive *nōn* from *nō* + *ne*, the latter member being either a second negative or a particle of emphasis seen in

men' obesse, illos prodesse, me obstare, illos obsequi! (Ennius ap. Cic. *De Div.* i. 31. 66: vide Minton Warren, *Am. J. Phil.* ii.).

The negative *nō* is found in the collocation *nōsve* = *nisi* in the Iguvine Tables VI. b 54, where *nōsve ier* = *nisi ibitur*, and is also to be seen in the form *noisi* = *nisi*, which occurs in the Duenos inscription and elsewhere.

But, further, may we not ask whether it is quite certain that *noenu* and *noenum* stand for *ne* + *oinom*? At any rate a different etymology will now at once suggest itself. *noe(nu)* may very well be identical with *noi(s)*, which is a combination of *nō* with the deictic *i* of *qui* and *oīroōi*. The second constituent of *noenum* will then be the enclitic equivalent of Greek *νῦ νῦν*. *m* in *-num* is no objection, vide *tum*. That the particle *nū* was originally a frequent addition to negatives is proved by Sanskrit *nanu* (*nenu*), already in R̥g-Veda a single word, and by the common conjunction of *oṽ nu* and *μη νυ* in Homeric Greek.

2. *νόδυνος* *νωλεμές* *νόνυμνος* *νωδός* *νωχελής* *νωχέλεια* *νωχάλος* *νώψ*.

In these words we might be tempted to find a trace of the negative *nō* established for Italic. But *ανόδυνος* *ανώνυμος* *ανώματος* *ανωφελής* *ανώμοτος* *ανώδης* *ανόροφος* and *ανόχυρος* render it necessary to regard the *ω* in all the cases as either the preposition *ω* Sk. *ā* or lengthened from *o* by a process corresponding to the Sk. *vrddhi*. What is noticeable in the words in question is that they are Greek instances of the full negative *ne* in composition, for which phenomenon cf. Lat. *neuter* &c. Sk. *nākis*, and perhaps also Greek *νέκταρ* = Sk. *akṣāra*. (1) The old derivation of *νόδυνος* &c. from *νη* + *οδνη* &c. is refuted by the circumstance that *νόνυμνος* is found in Homer and that we never hear of an intermediate form such as **νεωδυνος*.

F. W. THOMAS.

ELLIS'S NOCTES MANILIANAE.

NOCTES MANILIANAE sive dissertationes in Astronomica Manilii: accedunt coniecturae in Germanici Aratea: scripsit R. ELLIS (Clarendon Press, 1891). 6s.

THE readers of Manilius at the present day, whether in England or on the Continent, are few and far between. Nor can this be wondered at; the obscurity and difficulty of the author, both in regard to language and subject-matter, are great and notorious. Yet the astronomical (or rather astrological) poet cannot be neglected by those students of Latin Literature who would take a comprehensive view of their subject, and in particular desire to understand how men thought and wrote in the period of the early Empire. Nor was Manilius neglected by scholars like Scaliger and Bentley in an age which took a more liberal view of the scope of classical scholarship than is current at the present day. Manilius can never become a popular author; but it is well that some of our leading Latinists should open up new paths. The author of the beautiful lines which were inscribed by Goethe in a visitors' book on the Brocken (*Quis caelum posset nisi caeli munere nosse, Et reperire Deum nisi qui pars ipse Deorum est?*) deserves to be better known. To this end Mr. Ellis has devoted his best energies. He has prepared the way for a revised text of Manilius, which we may be

permitted to hope that he will some day produce: his present book is a worthy continuation of his indefatigable labours as editor of the *Ibis* and *Avienus*, and seems specially appropriate to the present day, when the interest in horoscopes and other parts of occult science felt under the early Empire seems to be reviving.

Almost everything concerning the author of the *Astronomica* has been matter of uncertainty. Teuffel (ed. Schwabe, 1890) regards his very name as a matter on which no opinion can be pronounced. This question I believe that Mr. Ellis has definitely settled, so far at any rate as the name *M. Manilius* goes. This name it is true is absent from the oldest MSS. or is inserted by a late hand (*Mālius*); but it probably comes from ancient sources. A letter of Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II., of a date about 1000 A.D., shows that the poet was known by the name of *Manilius* or *Manlius* in the Xth Century. It next turns up in the XVth Century in several MSS. of this date (sometimes in the form *M. Mallius*); also in a letter of Francesco Barbaro to Poggio (A.D. 1417): this piece of evidence may be of importance, as Poggio had discovered a new MS. of the poet at St. Gallen, and had no doubt previously communicated the name to Barbaro. A good deal will depend on what evidence is hereafter brought forward as to the age

of the St. Gallen MS. If it was an old one, then the name *Manilius* will rest upon indisputable evidence. In any case we may accept it with safety, however we explain the fact that it has disappeared from the Gemblacensis and other comparatively old MSS. Mr. Ellis accepts also either *Boenus*, which is appended to Book II. in the Vossianus Secundus, a MS. of the XVth Century (*M. Mallius Boenus*), or *Boetius*, which is appended in the same place in a MS. now at Madrid, also of the XVth Century (*M. Manilius Boetius*). Other XVth Century MSS. give *Boecus*, and some have regarded *Boenus* and *Boecus* as corruptions of *Boetius* and all three as arising from a confusion between our poet and the celebrated author of the *De Consolatione*, whose full name was Anicius Manlius [Torquatus] Severinus Boethius. On this point I should hardly like to express an opinion; but I feel inclined to doubt whether the additional name has more authority than the name *Nauta* which is in some MSS. attributed to Propertius (Teuffel, p. 551), or *Coquus*, attributed to Martial (Teuffel, p. 787).

The reader of Mr. Ellis' *Noctes* will perhaps be startled at the boldness with which Bentley is in many places attacked. Mr. Ellis is not sparing of his criticisms, and is evidently by no means inclined to defer to the authority of Bentley's name. I yield to no one in my admiration of Bentley as a critic; his work on Terence has been the foundation of all modern criticism of the old Latin scenic poets; it laid down the lines on which subsequent advances have been made. But it must be admitted that Mr. Ellis convicts Bentley of frequent lapses, due to impatience and excessive self-confidence. To some of these allusion will be made below. Mr. Ellis adds the charge that Bentley was unfair to his predecessor Huet (p. 161), cf. on V. 107, p. 209. On the other hand Bentley sometimes gives signs of his wonted brilliancy, e.g. in V. 737 (quoted by Prof. Jebb in his *Life of Bentley*, p. 144): and it is but fair to remember that his edition of Manilius was a work begun when he was a young man (A.D. 1691) and long laid aside, and that the responsibility of bringing it out (A.D. 1739) was ultimately thrown upon his nephew Richard Bentley.

A very interesting palaeographical problem is raised by Mr. Ellis. It is well known that Jacob in his edition of 1846, which still holds the field in spite of its extraordinary inaccuracies in details, treated Voss.² (XVth Cent.) as the basis on which

the text should be constituted. The error of this extreme view was clearly pointed out by Bechert, 'De M. Manilii emendandis ratione' (in *Leipziger Studien*, 1878), in which he established the claims of the Gemblacensis (Xth Cent.) to be the chief authority among MSS., maintaining that Voss.² was of altogether inferior importance. Mr. Ellis takes up an intermediate position, and, while regarding G as of primary importance, holds that neither it nor L (a MS. of a date about 50 years later) are sufficient without Voss.², of which he often speaks with great respect (cf. especially pp. 221 ff.). I have noted the following passages in which Voss.² contributes important evidence, not derivable, so far as is known at present, from other sources. II. 290 is defective in G:

haec ta ferunt Libram Capricornus et illum.

Voss.² has after *libram* the word *tortus*, which both Jacob and Ellis accept. II. 882 *non* Voss.², *nec* G, Cus., Voss.¹ After II. 902 Voss.² has a half verse (*per tanta pericula mortis*) wanting in all other MSS. III. 89 *Utrumque* Voss.², *Ut sit cum* G. In III. 283

Et totidem amittunt gelidas vergentia in umbras

Voss.² alone has the true reading *vergentia*; the others *gelidasque rigentia*. III. 537 *placeat* Voss.² is far superior to *pateat* G, Cus., *pateant* Voss.¹ b, o. IV. 417 *fugientia* Voss.², *fulgentia* G, Voss.¹, Cus. IV. 773 *sua* Voss.², *sub* G, Cus., o, *sibi* Voss.¹ V. 181 *uidere* Voss.² *uideri* G, Cus., Voss.¹ b, o. In a number of passages Voss.² shows some approach to the true reading: e.g. III. 332 *limite recto* b, o; *limiter octo* Voss.², *limitis octo* G: in III. 411 *ut* Voss.², b, o, seems better than *in* G, Cus., Voss.¹ III. 596 *olympias una* (ed. Neapolitana), *olimpus luna* Voss.², *olimpia luna* G, Cus., Voss.¹ b. V. 137 *ingenita est uisendi* (Bentley), *ingenio est uisendi* (Mr. Ellis; but can *ingenio* be a predicative dative?), *ingenies tuisendi* Voss.², *ingenium uiscendi* G. V. 176 *habentibus* Voss.², *habitantibus* G, Cus., Voss.¹ b, o. V. 183 *metuendus* (Scaliger, approved by Mr. Ellis), *mutandus* Voss.², *imitandus* G. In II. 489 Mr. Ellis finds support for his reading *Virgine mas capitur in mars* Voss.¹, *mares* Voss.²; G has *mens*. Similarly II. 233 *aequali sidere* Mr. Ellis, *atque illis digere* Voss.², *atque illi degere* G, Cus., Voss.¹ o. On the other hand Mr. Ellis does not deny that there are numerous passages in which Voss.² is corrupt, and sometimes agrees with

inferior MSS., though he does not admit with Bechert that traces of interpolation are to be found. Much light may be thrown upon the true position of Voss.² in the stemma of Manilian MSS. by an examination of the Madrid MS. This obviously stands in a close relation to the St. Gallen MS. discovered by Poggio, and also to Voss.² (cf. the position of the names *Boenus*, *Boetius*); either it is the very St. Gallen MS. itself or it is a copy of it. Mr. Ellis (p. 232) quotes Loewe to the effect that the handwriting is different from that of the Asconius and Valerius Flaccus which are bound up in the same volume. It would be particularly interesting to know the readings of this MS. in the passages cited above.

Any attempt to discuss the emendations of Mr. Ellis, which extend over the whole five books, must necessarily be inadequate. One of Mr. Ellis' most prominent characteristics is the closeness with which he follows even the most minute indications of the MSS. This does not however lead to a blind conservatism, as the following quotations will show. The palm for ingenuity is probably borne off by the reading proposed in IV. 422, which is generally read:

Laudatque cadit post paulum gratia ponti.

For *ponti* G alone has *xpi* or *xpi* = *Christi*. This looks at first sight like a 'jeu d'esprit' of some monk, and it has been generally so regarded, by Bentley and others. Mr. Ellis regards it as standing for *xysti* or *systi*, and justifies the scansion (*gratiā x.*) by examples from other poets and Manilius himself (short syll. before *zonae*, III. 319, 625). Yet the reading of all the other MSS. *ponti* must give us pause: how did it originate? May not *ponti* refer to the sea mentioned in the previous line (Et modo portus erat pelagi iam facta Charybdis)?—a sea in which a valuable harbour has disappeared.

IV. 369 is excellently emended to

Inque alio quaerendum aliquid iunctisque
sequendum
Viribus

G has *quaerenda mali cunctis*, other MSS. *quaerenda (-do) mali (mala) quid (quod est)*.

IV. 726. Mr. Ellis well defends *propior* (altered by Bentley to *proprio*, Voss.^{1,2} *proprior*), and takes it of local proximity. This gives a very good sense, the meaning being that Egypt is nearer to Italy than India and Aethiopia are. Mr. Ellis holds that the *Astronomica* was written in Italy: Prof. Jebb says between the years A.D. 9 and A.D. 14:

NO. XLV. VOL. V.

Teuffel places Book V. in the reign of Tiberius.

IV. 728. Mr. Ellis ably defends *Poenus* (*Paenus* G) against Bentley's *Phoebus*, and ingeniously suggests *torris* or *torres* for *terris* (MSS.):

Poenus harenosos Afrorum pulvere torris
Exsiccat populos.

IV. 801 is admirably emended—*pisce suborto* for the corrupt *piscis (pisces) uruptor (irruptor)*: cf. Hyginus P.A. II. 30 (*ibi figuram piscium forma mutasse*). Bentley accepted the far less attractive reading of Voss. *pisce sub atro*; Jacob proposed *pisce sub hirtio*.

V. 135. *pauidae* is a very good restoration of *fidae* (MSS.).

V. 209 f. Mr. Ellis remarks that *Sirius* may well be said *radios movere*, and that *Dimicat in cineres orbis* is really impossible, though accepted by Bentley and Jacob.

III. 403. For *nascentia sidera Tauro* Mr. Ellis reads *nascenti ad sidera Tauro*, i.e. 'Taurus rising into his stars.'

II. 475. *aliorum...aliorum* is ingenious (*aliorum...aliorum* MSS.).

IV. 876-882 is a very difficult passage. Bentley violently transposed 882 to 877, and there condemned it as corrupt; in 876 he read *est munere*. Mr. Ellis maintains the genuineness of the MS. reading:—

Perspicimus caelum: cur non et munera
caeli
Inque ipsos penitus mundi descendere
census
Seminibusque suis tantam componere
molem.

Perhaps we may regard the infinitives *descendere*, *componere* as subjects and *munera* as the predicate nominative (supplying *sunt*). This seems better than to connect *munera* as object with *perspicimus*, as Mr. Ellis does.

It would be easy to multiply examples of felicitous emendations; but it may be more to the point to devote what space remains at my disposal to a consideration of some passages in which Mr. Ellis has not convinced me, though I am aware that in doing so I may merely expose my own infirmities.

V. 168. Ille potens turba perfundere mem-
bra pilatum

Per totumque vagas corpus dis-
ponere palmas.

The passage describes the dexterity of a person throwing and catching balls. G has *membra pilatum* (according to Thomas' ex-

E E

cellent collation), whence Scaliger, followed by Bentley, wrote *membra pilarum*. This gives, I think, a better sense and is nearer to the MSS. than Mr. Ellis' *crura pilarum*; not merely the legs but all the limbs of the play are enveloped in a shower of balls.

IV. 85-87. Most MSS. have

Quod Decios non omne tulit, non omne
Camillos
Tempus, et *inuicta deuictum morte* Ca-
tonem,
Materies in rem superat, *sed lege re-*
pugnat.

Bentley read *inuicta deuictum mente* and *res* (for *sed*); Markland *inuicta deuictum morte*; Scaliger and Jacob *inuictum deuicta morte* (so b); Mr. Ellis *inuictum uicta de morte*. This no doubt enables us to see how the MS. reading may have arisen; but I doubt whether *inuictum de* will stand. Perhaps read *inuicta defunctum morte*; cf. Q. Curtius V. 8, 11 *cum liceat...aut reparare quae amisi aut honesta morte defungi*. In the next line Mr. Ellis accepts *sed* and takes *repugnat* impersonally: may not the subject be *materies*? 'there is abundance of material, but it comes into conflict with Law' (the law of Fate).

IV. 729. Holding that the second syllable of *Mauritania* is short (so Georges; Lewis and Short give it long), Mr. Ellis believes that we have here a genitive *Mauri*, agreeing with *oris* (730), and that the last part of the word is corrupt (for *Mauri belua* or *Mauri citrea*). But the name of a country suits the context better as subject of the sentence (*Mauritania nomen | oris habet, titulumque suo fert ipsa colore*) than the elephant or the citron-tree. Can it be said to be certain that Manilius did not scan *Mauritania*?

II. 168 f. *Nihil exterius mirantur in ipsis*
Admissumque dolent, quaedam quod parte
recisa

Atque ex diverso commissis corpore mem-
bris.

So G. The passage describes the heterogeneous signs of the Zodiac such as Capricornus and the Bowman, in contradistinction to those compounded of like parts, the Gemini and Pisces. I agree with Mr. Ellis in taking *quod* as the relative; but I think it is not necessary to accept *Amisumme* from Molinius, though I see that this was accepted by Scaliger and Bentley. Why not read *quod quaedam* (sc. *admissum dolent*): 'they are annoyed at no addition from without, such as certain signs (are), which have lost a part of themselves, and have had their limbs made up from a different body.'

II. 223-229. I confess I do not see how the sentence proceeds if we read *Quod* (so MSS. and Mr. Ellis). *Cancer* and *pisces* must be regarded as examples of marine constellations. Mr. Ellis regards *ut quae* (= *idem in his accidit quod in eis quae*) as beginning the principal clause. If Manilius wrote so, he wrote very obscurely.

II. 253. Thomas' *Contra te et* deserves notice.

I. 868. Bentley's *ut cuncta* seems to yield a better sense than Mr. Ellis' *obducta* (MSS. *ob cuncta*). For the change of *ducta* into *cuncta* Mr. Ellis compares II. 337 where the MSS. have *cunctis* and he reads *ductus*.

I. 25 f. *Quem primum interius licuit cog-*
noscere terris

Munera (or Munere) caelestium.

Here I prefer to take *quem* as relative. Reading *munera* I should take *quem* (= *vatem canentem*) as subject to *cognoscere*: 'it has been granted to mortals (*terris*) that I should be the first to attain to deeper knowledge of the immortals'; or, reading *munere*, *quem* may be the object of *cognoscere*: 'to attain to deeper knowledge of it has been first (*primum* = *nunc primum*?) granted to mortals by the gift of the immortals': so Thomas and Kramer.

E. A. SONNENSCHIN.

AN EIGHTH-CENTURY LATIN ANGLO-SAXON GLOSSARY.

An Eighth-Century Latin—Anglo-Saxon Glossary, Preserved in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Edited by J. H. HESSELS. Cambridge: University Press. 1890. 10s.

THIS volume is an important contribution to the literature of Latin glossaries. Mr. Hessels

has, for the first time, published a complete transcript, with a valuable introduction, of the eighth-century Latin glossary in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. It consists of two parts: (1) Hebrew-Latin and Greek-Latin; (2) Latin—Latin combined with Latin—Anglo-Saxon. The Latin—Anglo-Saxon glosses had been excerpted

by Wülfker from a transcript made by Zupitza, and published in his edition of Thomas Wright's *Vocabularies* (1884). But the glossary had never been edited as a whole.

Mr. Hessels tells us (p. xiii.) that 'the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press informed him that the edition was to be merely an exact reproduction of the MS., that is to say, with all its scribal mistakes, errors of grammar, erroneous divisions of words, peculiarities of spelling, etc., etc., without an elucidation of any, even the most corrupt, glosses; and that his notes should be strictly confined to explanations of the graphical alterations or corrections made by the scribe or his corrector.' To this plan, which was practically his own, the editor has, except in a few instances, adhered.

The introduction, which students not only of glossaries but of textual criticism will find extremely useful, contains a description of the MS., an account of the main abbreviations employed in it, of its confusions, transpositions, omissions, and additions of letters, with a discussion of some isolated points. The value of the whole work consists first, of course, in the publication of the glossary itself. The glossary is in positive value not of the first rank. It stands below the Vatican Glossary recently edited by Goetz, and the glossaries of 'Philoxenus' and 'Cyril.' But there is much in it which deserves careful study, and which will help critics in their attempts to understand the older specimens of this curious literature.

Secondly, the lists which Mr. Hessels has made of the confusions and other corruptions of letters will add to our knowledge of late Latin forms. The material here amassed should be added to that collected by the editors of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, by Goelzer in his book on the Latinity of Jerome, and by Bonnet in his great work upon Gregory of Tours. The time has hardly yet arrived for a complete digest of these materials: but Mr. Hessels' labours are a contribution by no means insignificant to the whole work.

The present writer has no claim to speak on the subject of Latin—Anglo-Saxon glosses; but the following notes on some of the Latin-Latin glosses have occurred to him in reading through Mr. Hessels' pages.

P. xvii.—Among other instances of truncation Mr. Hessels quotes F 242 *florea* for *floralia*, and I 241 *interpola* for *interpolata*. I am inclined to think that the gloss *florea tempora florum* is a corruption of two, *florea* (perhaps Vergil's *florea rura*) and

Floralia, tempora florum. *Interpola* may stand in spite of I 340: the shorter form occurs in Isidore 19 22 23, and Gloss. Vat. p. 99 27 (Goetz) *interpolis* (i.e. *interpola*) *vestis*.

P. xviii.—To the list of transpositions add A 403, *agmine fulmine*, where *fulmine* probably = *flumine*: C 326 *celebra* = *lecebra*.

P. xix.—P. 333 *pecunia* for *pecua*. Not necessarily: the gloss as it stands gives *pecunia armenta*, which may represent a statement that *pecunia* originally meant possessions in the form of cattle: Festus p. 213 Müller (*peculium*) *inductum est a pecore, ut pecunia quoque ipsa*.

P. xix.—'A (capital) for B: A 940 (*Aubulus* for *Bubulus*). *Aubulus* may however stand for *aububulus* (Epinal 5 C 14), a form accepted by Löwe, *Prodromus* p. 348.

P. xxii.—'b for p... A 64' (*abtet vos, impleat vos*). *Abtet* more probably stands for *habitet*. *Ibid.*—'*Coarta* for *coarcta*' (A 732). More probably for *coorta*: Aen. i. 148 *coorta est Seditio*.

P. xxiii.—§ 41 :—*Croccitus* is recorded as a mistake for *crocitus*. It is probably the correct form, being given by the MSS. of Plautus *Aul.* 2 2 14 (*grocchibat*), and by the Harleian MS. in Nonius p. 45.

P. xxvii.—'C. 593 (*conferata* for *conserta*). The gloss is *conferata consociata*; I am inclined to read *confodusta*.

Ibid.—'*f* for *h*: F 58 (*fariolus* for *hariolus*). *Fariolus* is the older form: see Terentius Scaurus p. 26 Keil, quoted by the present writer in his 'Contributions' p. 455.

Ibid.—*Eruli* and *erus* are surely the correct forms, *heruli* and *herus* incorrect.

P. xxviii.—*Holitor* should not be put down as a mistake for *olitor*: hardly even *honera* for *onera*, for a form *honus* was recognized, or at least supposed, by the grammarians.

Ibid.—*Lychini* for *lychni* is treated as an instance of *i* wrongly inserted: but *lychinus* is the genuine Latin form.

Ibid.—*Stinc* is hardly an error for *istinc*: at any rate it is found in the Medicean MS. of Vergil Aen. 6 389 *iam stinc, et comprime gressum*.

P. xxix.—*Lxiviva* may stand, not for *lixivia*, but for *lixiva* (*cinis*).

P. xxx.—*Paedagogum eruditiorum puerorum*. The change required is probably *paedagogium* for *paedagogum*. '*Pelleum* for *pileum*.' *Pilleus* is the right form.

P. xxxii.—*Formonsum* is a correct form. *Epilenticus* is a mistake, not for *epilepticus*, but for *epilempiticus*, the *n* standing, not for *p*, but for *m*. *Ibid.* '*lucenosa* for *lacerosa*.' More probably for *laciniosa*.

P. xxxiii.—*Pupicus* is right, not a mistake for *publicus*.

P. xxxv.—*Accussat* and *recussavere* may well represent a good tradition: *obessus*, again, is not wrong for *obesus*; see 'Contributions' etc. p. 538. The instances of *s* omitted after *x* (*exertus* etc.) should not be registered as mistakes.

P. xxxvii.—*Vatillum* is now acknowledged to be the correct form, not *batillum*.

I append a few instances of confusion of letters which seem to have escaped Mr. Hessels, and a few additional instances of the confusions which he has recorded: P. xxii. *a* for *is*, C 104 *calla* for *callis*. *Ibid.* As an instance of *a* inserted, add C 13 *carauma* = γράμμα. *a* for *er*, F 24 *faria eloquia* for *farier eloquier*. *Ibid.* *b* for *ci*, A 68 *abdus ab hacrore* (= *acidus*). *b* for *g*, I 303 *iubit* for *iugit*. P. xxiii. *c* for *o* (or *od*), C 71 *caeporicon* (= *odoeporicon*) *iterarium*. For *di*, C. 447 *clanculum mare* for *diluculum mane*. P. xxvi. *en* for *m*, E 198 *enicha adultera* for *moecha*. P. xxviii. *g* for *o*, A 345 *Aeglea patria ventorum* (= *Aeolia*). P. xxix. *ia* for *η*, A 724 *archia initium* (=

ἀρχή). P. xxx. *iu* for *ni*, A 464 *alterius agunt* (= *alternis*). For *y*, C 209 *candius* (= *sandyx*) *vestis regia*. P. xxxi. *l* for *d*, B 145 *Bosborius lux lucis* (*Phosphorus, dux*). *Ibid.* *l* for *s*, A 943 *avvultis regalibus*, for *augustis*. *Ibid.* To the instances of *m* inserted add *artemta* (A 752) for *artempta* = *artepta*. P. xxxii. *ni* for *m*, P. 105 *palniatus* for *palmatas*. P. xxxv. *s* for *e*, A 922 *austis opotatis* (= *avetis optatis*). *si* for *z*, G 70 *gesiae* for *gazae*: *si* for *c*, I 239 *insilitus* for *inclitus*. P. xxxvi. *t* for *s*, C 50 *castum* (= *cassum*) *vacuum*. P. xxxvii. *ti* for *u*, A 334 *aerectatio* (= *aere cavo*) *tuba*: B 159 *botitum* = *votivum*. *t* for *g*, A 697 *apototyos* for *apologias*. P. xxxviii. *u* for *ci*, F 122 *fenicum cocumum* (for *coccinum*).

The puzzling gloss A 907, *avlaeis superbis*, *pulchris amoenibus*, should probably be written (not *p. amoenis*) but *pulchris velaminibus*: see *glossae Vergilianae* in Goetz's fourth volume. p. 431 24. The gloss having been written *pulchris vel aminibus*, *vel* was taken for the conjunction and dropped: *aminibus* was then changed into *amoenibus*.

H. NETTLESHIP.

SEYFFERT'S DICTIONARY OF CLASSICAL ANTIQUITIES.

A Dictionary of Classical Antiquities, Mythology, Religion, Literature and Art, from the German of DR. OSCAR SEYFFERT, revised and edited, with additions, by H. NETTLESHIP and J. E. SANDYS, with more than 450 Illustrations. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1891. 21s.

It is hardly necessary to add anything to the chorus of general approval with which this English edition of Dr. Seyffert's *Lexikon der klassischen Alterthumskunde* has been widely received. The daily and weekly journals, which undertake to answer for the needs of the 'general reader,' have with great unanimity pronounced this just what was wanted for his requirements. It remains only to look at it from the point of view of the student, and to consider if there are any cases in which it gives him inadequate or untrustworthy guidance. The English publishers have certainly been fortunate in the editors whose aid they have secured. If there are any two scholars whose names are guarantees for careful and minute accuracy of work, they are the Professor of Latin at Oxford and the Public Orator of Cambridge. It cannot be questioned that they have added

materially to the value of the original. Professor Nettleship's notes on Latin literature, and the important articles by Dr. Sandys on Painting, Engraving, and Vases are alone enough to give an independent value to this edition. But the question can hardly fail to arise whether the original plan was that best fitted for a volume of the size and cost of the present one. There is a demand for an authoritative work of reference, in which questions may be treated with some fulness, and which may serve as a guide to the original authorities and to the best modern treatises. There is also a demand for a cheap abridgement, which may be put into the hands of every fifth or sixth form schoolboy, and in which he may find information enough for his immediate needs. But it is hard to see what class of students is served by a guinea volume, in which most of the articles are of necessity somewhat slight, and where there is not a reference to an ancient or modern authority, except such as have been, only too sparingly, though much more fully in the latter half of the book, introduced by the editors. It seems probable that the utility of the book will rather lie in the service which it may

do to those who are not professed students, but who may be attracted by the numerous and excellent illustrations, and may be glad to have on their shelves a book of reference which they can trust so far as it goes. Indeed the extreme care taken to mark quantities throughout, and to give the Latin form of every Greek word seems to indicate that this is the class especially kept in view.

An instance of a thoroughly unsatisfactory result due to the 'popular' character of the articles is furnished by the treatment of *Caprotina*. 'After their defeat by the Greeks, the Romans were conquered and put to flight by a sudden attack of their neighbours, and the enemies demanded the surrender of all the girls and married women. Thereupon at the suggestion of a girl called Tutula (or Philotis), the female slaves disguised as Roman ladies went into the enemy's camp, contrived to make the enemy drunk, and then, climbing into a wild fig-tree, gave the signal for the Romans to attack by holding up a torch.' 'Greeks' is here only a curious slip for 'Gauls'; but if the story was worth telling at all, it was surely worth while saying who the enemies were, that Varro (vi. 18) tacitly discards the story, that Plutarch (*Rom.* c. 29) represents the Latins as asking for marriage alliances with virgins and widows (the latter being omitted: *Camill.* 33), and that the absurd *matres familias* comes only from Macrobius i. 11, 37. Cp. Niebuhr *Hist.* ii. 573. It is needless to say that no authority represents all the slaves as climbing the fig-tree.

Prof. Nettleship might have had the courage to draw his editorial pen through or *Quintus* added to *Gaius* as the praenomen of Catullus. By the way there is a queer statement in the article on names:—'Some [praenomina] were employed only by certain gentes, even by certain families, as for instance *Appius* exclusively by the *Claudii* and *Tiberius* by the line of the *Nérônes* who belonged to this race; while others were actually prohibited in certain families e.g. *Marcus* in that of the *Manlii*.' *Tiberius Sempronius* is a tolerably familiar combina-

tion; and even when the reader has corrected *Manlii* to *Manli* he will be puzzled to read about *Marcus Manlius* until he gets information from some other quarter as to the date of the prohibition. The irregularity in the use of cognomina surely began before 70 A.D. What of Paullus Fabius Maximus, or Drusus Claudius Nero? It seems more than doubtful whether *andabatae* fought on horseback (cp. Friedländer ii.⁶ 535). Under the head of *Athenaeus* we find the very doubtful statement that he lived at Alexandria from 170-230 A.D. These dates cannot be fixed with any certainty. It might have been noted too that *Larensius* is only the Greek form of *Laurentius*, a much more probable Roman name. There is no article *concilium*, but under the head of *comitia* we read that out of the *concilia plebis* grew the *comitia tributa*, a very misleading and inadequate statement of the case. Mommsen's views as to the *comitia curiata* are entirely ignored.

It is perhaps in the mythological articles that we most feel the lack of references. An attempt is made to narrate the story in the most compressed form, which does not always tend to clearness: but too often it is pieced together out of different authorities without any notice being taken of their discrepancies: cp. e.g. the narrative of the relations of Atreus and Thyestes, or the story of Catreus.

It is not quite clear what the editors mean by saying that they follow Marquardt in reckoning 1000 sesterces as equivalent to £10. He gives the value of 1000 sesterces at 175 marks, i.e. not far from £8 10s.: their estimate has further the disadvantage of making too marked a difference between the drachma, which they take at 8d., and the *denarius*, which they thus bring out at 9½d. At the same time on p. 148 b the value of the *denarius* is given at about 7½d. This will surely be very confusing to students.

The printing is remarkably correct: *Suidas*, and *Bibliotheca* are the only errors that I have noticed: 'the *contiones*' on p. 162 b is perhaps a misprint for 'four.'

A. S. WILKINS.

Decii Iuvenalis Saturae erklärt, von ANDREAS WEIDNER. Zweite und umgearbeitete Auflage. Leipzig. 1889.

HERR WEIDNER's second edition has in the main the same excellences and defects as the first, but as the former have certainly been considerably increased,

and the latter sensibly diminished, we may welcome the new edition as a distinct gain. The introduction, now consisting of xxxii. pages, has been to a great extent rewritten, and is divided into two parts: (1) dealing with Juvenal's life and authorship; (2) containing some information with regard to the sources of the text. The first part is to some extent

marred by the confused arrangement of the various points touched on, the sections on the known facts of Juvenal's life, the date of his *Satires*, the successive stages of his style and his character as a poet, following and preceding one another in a most bewildering fashion. Nor is Herr Weidner's criticism of the data at our disposal for the reconstruction of Juvenal's life entirely consistent and clear. If the various 'vitae' are to be pronounced as wholly useless and unhistorical, or at least as containing nothing which we do not know from other sources, it would seem all the more important carefully to collect all the notices in the *Satires* bearing on this subject, and to consider what inferences may safely be drawn from the Inscription of Aquinum. But this our editor does very insufficiently, and though he has had Dr. Dürr's *das Leben Juvenals* before him, he has, it would seem, made singularly little use of what at the very least is the most striking contribution made to the subject in recent years. Again, if the 'vitae' are to be put entirely out of account, it is difficult to see on what ground Herr Weidner without any hesitation accepts the statement in the most recent of them all, viz. that in the Barberini MS.—that Juvenal was born in 55 A.D. In this, as in several other opinions put forward, as e.g. that on Juvenal's banishment, the correct view is probably taken; but as they are not the result of any well-grounded criticism, but rather of a haphazard kind of procedure, they lose much of their value. On what ground by the way does Herr Weidner assume from the names Decius Junius that Juvenal's father cannot, as the 'vitae' say, have been a libertinus? I should rather draw the opposite conclusion. The second part of the introduction dealing with the text is contained on five pages, and might perhaps with advantage have been a little fuller, especially in an edition which we presume from the insertion of *Satires* ii. vi. and ix. is not intended for school use. At any rate we can hardly consider any account of the MS. authority for Juvenal complete, which makes no mention of the Florilegium Sangallense, the principal source of perhaps the most important new reading, 'sufflamine nullo consul' (viii. 148). The commentary, which is much fuller and also much better than in the first edition, is decidedly the best part of the work. Many of the notes are no doubt unnecessarily wordy, much information is given which can be found in any Classical Dictionary, and examples of quite familiar grammatical constructions are often needlessly multiplied, while actual repetition is not infrequent. Still the notes as a rule give the requisite information about men and things; and are illustrated, often quite independently of previous editions, by very well selected citations. That Herr Weidner is always happy in his interpretation, it cannot be said. At times indeed his judgment seems utterly to forsake him, and we must express the hope that, before a third edition is called for, he will reconsider his explanation of the following passages among others. In *Sat.* iii. 218, following the reading of P. 'haec Asianorum,' he takes haec...vetera ornamenta as in apposition to 'aliquid praeclarum Euphranoris aut Polycliti,' haec meaning 'these here in Rome.' Whether this is better than the old way of referring haec (nom. sing.) to some rich lady, is doubtful. Personally, I prefer 'phaecasiatorum' as an easy corruption of P. In vii. 92, praefectos Pelopea etc. Herr Weidner takes Pelopea and Philomela 'men who play in pantomime these unfitting parts.' Surely like Agave in line 87 these are the names of 'fabulae salticae.' In viii. 58 palma fervet is curiously translated 'hands are clapped with fervour.' In xvi. 25, on 'quis tam procul absit ab urbe,' Herr

Weidner remarks: 'one must live a long way remote from Rome, and consequently be very ignorant of life there, to venture into the praetorian camp as advocate of a civilian.' But first 'absit' is an impossible mood and tense for this meaning, and (2) with this translation 'tam procul absit' and 'tam Pylades cease to be parallel expressions, as they are.

Passing to Herr Weidner's treatment of the text, a much less favourable judgment must be pronounced. In most cases it is true he has adopted the new readings of Bicheler's edition, though he still retains adiutor for auditor (iii. 322), Dolabella hinc atque hinc for Dolabellae atque istinc (viii. 105), and casum lugentis for causam dicentis (xv. 134). But it is in the arbitrary and most injudicious admission of his own conjectures that the method of Herr Weidner appears to be thoroughly unwarranted. Out of about seventy emendations of this kind I give some of the most unjustifiable. In iii. 104 (omnis W. omni P.) 'semper et omnis' is translated 'always and with my whole being.' In iii. 114 quite unnecessarily coepit is altered into cogit: in iii. 232 moritur vigilando becomes moritur vigilansque, aeger and vigilans being taken as praedicative to plurimus: in iv. 116 repente satelles takes the place of 'a pontesatelles': in vii. 184 we find quanti cuique domus instead of quanticunque, a reading which implies that the price of a 'structor' was as great as that of a luxurious house: in vii. 194 'et si perfrixit, cantat bene' becomes 'et ni perfrixit' whereby the irony of the passage is lost; in viii. 7 the second 'Corvinum' is altered into 'Arvinum' merely because a dictator of that name is mentioned in Liv. viii. 38; in viii. 124 iaculum et galeam is altered to iaculo et galea, governed by spoliatis: in viii. 220, to the destruction of all point and meaning in the passage, Herr Weidner alters 'numquam cantavit Orestes' into numquam cantavit Orestem, entirely forgetting that Orestes is the subject of the whole sentence: in viii. 239 'in omni monte' becomes 'inermi menti': in x. 54 the difficult line 'Ergo supervacua' etc. receives a new, but by no means improved interpretation by the reading 'ergo supervacua est,' Fortuna being taken as the subject: in xi. 186 by altering 'sed nec structor' into si, and putting a comma only at secatur, the connexion of the sentences is entirely altered, and certainly not for the better. In xi. 146 he reads 'non a mangone petitus quisquam erit Armenio' instead of 'in magno' or 'et magno.' If guesses of this kind are to be admitted, we should be glad to know what canons of criticism our editor recognises. In xii. 32 we have 'arboris incertae nutu,' and in the next line 'non ferret' instead of 'cum ferret.' In xiii. 178 Juvenal says: 'your loss nevertheless remains, nor will your deposit ever be secure; but the least drop of blood will give you a comfort at the price of general detestation (invidiosa). Herr Weidner entirely alters and weakens the passage by changing sed into si. Less radical but hardly more necessary changes are produced for deducere (vii. 54): unda Leucade for non Leucade (viii. 241): viventi est for viventibus (x. 243): nunc aetas gravior for nunc aetas agitur (xiii. 28): stupet is Germanis for stupuit Germani (xiii. 164): percipit for praecipit (xiv. 16): dum sic aedificat for dum sic ergo habitat (xiv. 92): gratulor, en et for gratulor, et te (xv. 86). Out of all Herr Weidner's emendations, there really seem to be only four, and these not very important, which make any improvement in the text: x. 84 quam timeo victis (victus P.), ne poenas exigat Ajax: xiii. 208 laeva voluntas for saeva voluptas: xiv. 24 inscripti, ergastula, for inscripta, ergastula, a conjecture made independently by Mr. H. Richards of Wadham in

the *Classical Review* vol. ii. p. 326 b, and xiv. 229 *patrimonia conduplicandi* for *patrimonia conduplicare*. We may note in conclusion that, though there is a complete Index of proper names, the want of a subject Index is in many respects an inconvenience.

E. G. HARDY.

A Short Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin for Schools and Colleges, by VICTOR HENRY, translated by R. T. ELLIOTT, M.A. Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 1890. 7s. 6d.

THIS is an accurate translation of a very good book. The merits of the original it is not necessary to dwell on now as M. Henry's *Précis de Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin* has already been noticed in the *Classical Review* (vol. iii. p. 210). The highest ideal which the translator of a book of this sort could set before himself would be to rival the lucidity of the original, and the English of Mr. Elliott is almost as clear as the French of M. Henry. Mr. Elliott like other translators of foreign philological works had to face to some extent the difficulty of making for himself the technical terminology required. M. Henry, when dealing with the mysteries of 'Ablaut,' objects strongly to the German terminology which describes the *e*-forms of a root as the 'middle' and the *o*-forms as the 'strong' grade. The objection is well founded and a new term (*flechi*) had to be invented which Mr. Elliott has translated by 'deflected.' As the word has not been used before so far as I know in Philology it is free from ambiguity, but can hardly be said to convey to the reader any very definite idea of the origin of the variation between *e* and *o* forms.

It is naturally not the province of a translator to set his author right; but as Mr. Elliott has improved the book for English readers by adding occasionally an English example where a French one was cited by M. Henry, one cannot help wishing that he had also removed some trifling obscurities and ambiguities in the original. In § 7 (p. 4) the beginner is likely to feel puzzled over the statement that 'inscriptions apart from the necessarily limited number of mistakes on the part of the writers give us absolutely accurate information.' Similarly in § 9 (e) the information about *-ττ-* and *-σσ-* is put so briefly as to convey an erroneous idea, and the statement on p. 86 note 7 that **ῥος* = Skt. *yā-va-* when put thus without any limitation is likely to lead the novice into an ancient heresy about final *s* and *t*. These are small points indeed, but I mention them because in using the book with my own pupils I found they were misunderstood. By an oversight on the part of the translator *alithum* (p. 223 note 2) is described as an ablative.

On the title-page the book is described as one for schools and colleges, but notwithstanding its lucidity I am afraid it is much too hard for schoolboys, in England at least. The English schoolboy who devotes himself to the study of languages is generally so unversed in scientific ideas that the very precision of a book like this is to him a difficulty. The difficulty in this case is increased by the brevity of the introduction which postulates more knowledge than he possesses and plunges him too rapidly into a sea of ideas of which he previously knew nothing. Thus the very excellence of the book as a scientific manual militates against its success (*experto crede*) as a book for beginners. For those however who know the elements of the science already no better book could be found, and the translator has done good service by making M. Henry's treatise accessible to a wider public in this country than it would otherwise have obtained.

P. GILES.

Hermann Paul's Principles of the History of Language, translated by H. A. STRONG, M. A., LL.D. Sonnenschein: 10s. 6d. New Edition, 1890.

THE first edition of this translation was noticed in the *Classical Review*, Vol. iii. p. 180 a. f.; the work has now been carefully revised throughout, but most of what was there said both of its merits and defects is still applicable. In point of fact, as his readers know to their cost, Prof. Paul's style is not fitted to impart lucidity to an obscure subject, and Prof. Strong has not been able to emancipate himself sufficiently from the original to avoid the translator's bane—foreign forms of thought in English words. Where our praise is rightfully due to Prof. Strong is for the talents and research that he has brought to bear on his task so that his translation is a more valuable work than the original.

Many controversial topics of course suggest themselves on reading the book, but this is not the place to raise them. There still remain errata to be corrected, but we confine ourselves to one instance in which the mischief is serious. On p. 192 of the English version we read 'According to Verner's Law, in the original German a regular change has set in between the hard and the soft fricative (*h-ç, þ-ð, f-t, s-z*), and this change &c.' We are inclined to think that the examples in the brackets will seem to most readers to lack relevancy. On turning to the German (p. 153) we find 'Durch das Vernersche gesetz ist im urgermanischen ein durchgreifender wechsel zwischen hartem und weichem reibelaut entstanden (*h-ç, þ-ð, f-b, s-z*), bedingt usw,' from which it is apparent that Prof. Paul has misprinted *ç* for *z* (soft guttural-fricative) and Prof. Strong has followed him with the additional misprint of *t* for *b* (soft labial-fricative). Another instance of a mistake copied from the original is on p. 374 (= 279) where *debonnaire* is given as from *de bonne air*; it should of course be *de bon air* although *de bonne aire* would have some justification.

H. D. DARBISHIRE.

Notes on Greek Manuscripts in Italian Libraries, by THOMAS WILLIAM ALLEN. London: Nutt. 1890. 3s. 6d.

MR. ALLEN has reprinted in this little volume the notes on Greek Manuscripts in Italian Libraries which he contributed to the *Classical Review* in 1889 and 1890, correcting and amplifying, and adding in his Preface memoranda of subsequent visits to other libraries at Brescia, Ferrara, Messina, Palermo, etc. We have thus descriptions of 470 MSS., out of which 64 bear actual dates. An Index of Classical authors is added.

E. M. T.

The Alcestis of Euripides, by M. A. BAYFIELD. Macmillan & Co. (Elementary Classics.) 1s. 6d.

THIS edition seems excellently adapted for the use of junior forms: the notes are short, and such as to supply a foundation for accurate scholarship: there are none of those 'fictions' which, introduced with the false idea of smoothing the beginner's path, have to be unlearned later on. To me however it seems a mistake to give notes such as '*προβηκη* = *προβηκα*,' *ῥδε* from *ῥδω*, &c. Young boys should go to their grammar and dictionary for accidence, and notes should be given on syntax, where reference is perhaps beyond them: just as older boys may be left to

¹ It ought not to be necessary to draw Prof. Strong's attention to the fact that 'germanisch' does not mean 'German' but 'Teutonic.'

consult grammars for easy syntax, but should have harder usages explained in notes. The only fault in this book is that it must tend to check the habit of using books of reference. The vocabulary is a case in point. Mr Bayfield's practical experience however is entitled to much weight. Is it not misleading to

give 'ἀλίσκομαι, capture, grasp'? The note on 617 is repeated on 935. In 1128 'necromancer' seems a faulty rendering of ψυχαγωγός. The introduction is concise, and the appendix on the particles useful. There is a misprint at the top of p. 51.

W. S. HADLEY.

NOTES.

NOTES ON AESCHYLUS, *Agamemnon*.

(1) l. 557.—

μόχθους γὰρ εἰ λέγοιμι καὶ δυσαυλίας,
σπαρνὰς παρήξει καὶ κακοστρώτους, τί δ' οὐ
στένοντες οὐ λαχόντες ἡμᾶτος μέρος;

If Mr. Sidgwick is right in believing some word like κλαίοντες to have fallen out, I would suggest οὐδ' ἀχούντες as possible. This gives the required sense, and supposes the very slight alteration of Δ into Λ (instanced in this very play, where οὐ λέγω appears in the MSS. for οὐδ' ἐγώ), upon which the omission of ν would naturally follow.

(2) l. 1118.—

ἐ, ἔ, παπαῖ, παπαῖ, τί τόδε φαίνεται;
ἢ δίκτυόν τί γ' "Αἰδου;
ἀλλ' ἄρκυς ἢ ξύνευρος, ἢ ξυναίτια
φόνου. Στάσις δ' ἀκρόετος γένει
κατολουζέτω θύματος λευσίμου.

θύματος λευσίμου has given great difficulty, and has not yet been satisfactorily, though it has been plausibly, explained. If we read λουσίμου (a legitimate formation from λούω) we get an easy and simple sense. 'And let Strife, insatiate toward the race, howl against the sacrifice of the bath.' This follows naturally on δίκτυον and ἄρκυς.

(3) l. 1125.—

ἄ, ἄ, ἰδοῦ, ἰδοῦ ἀπεχε τῆς βοῆς
τὴν ταῦρον ἐν πέποισιν
μελαγκέρφ λαβοῦσα μηχανώματι
τύπτει πιτνεῖ δ' ἐν ἐνύδρῳ κύτει.
δολοφόνου λέβητος τύχαν σοι λέγω.

μελαγκέρφ μηχανώματι seems to explain the bold comparison in the line before of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra to a bull and a heifer. The words must by position be taken with λαβοῦσα, and must owing to the context be a description of the weapon of offence. The former, apart from other considerations, forbids us to take the words as meaning the axe: the latter prevents us from supposing an allusion to Agamemnon enshrouded in the black robe, and holding up his arms like horns. But if applied to Clytemnestra, both conditions are satisfied and a really striking picture is presented to us. The murderess advancing with her head bent down, and enshrouded in the black robe which she holds outstretched in her protruded hands, is compared to a heifer charging upon her mate, the bull.

(4) l. 1227.

νεῶν τ' ἑπαρχος Ἰάλιον τ' ἀναστάτης
οὐκ ὀδεν ὅλα γλῶσσαις μισητῆς κυνὸς
λέξασα κἀκτείνασα φαιδρόνους, δίκην
ἄτης λαθραίου, τεύζεται κακῇ τύχῃ.

(1) If we write ἄτης with a capital letter, the connection between the workings of the Spirit of Infatuation and Clytemnestra's speech of welcome to Agamemnon becomes plain. In both the first announcement of approaching ruin is such that it is hailed by the blinded victim with deluded exultation: cp. the irony of Clytemnestra with Ate's message to Oedipus in the *Œ. T.* announcing that his father Polybus is dead.

(2) If we separate οἶα from τεύζεται, taking the latter absolutely 'to hit the mark,' like κυρεῖν, the linguistic difficulties are done away with. Thus: 'he knows not the real meaning of the fell adulteress' words, which with her long-drawn smiling welcome she spoke like a covert Infatuation, alas with too good point!'

E. A. L. M.

* *

The objection to taking τεύζεται absolutely with δίκην in the sense of 'like' is the order; δίκην in this sense regularly comes after its gen. and could hardly be separated from it by the end of a line, at least not in Aeschylus. If on the other hand we take δίκην = retribution, and govern it by τεύζεται from τεύχω, the sense is clear: 'exact the retribution due to a secret curse,' or (reading ἄτης) 'the retribution of a secret Fury.' In any case οἶα is governed by λέξασα κἀκτείνασα, a natural phrase in view of the common ἐκτείνω λόγον. I can quote no parallel use of τεύχειν δίκην, nor does ποιεῖν or ποιεῖσθαι seem to occur with δίκην: the nearest phrases are δίκην ἔχειν and δίκην ἐπιτιθεῖναι.

H. L. B.

* *

AESCHYLUS, *Supp.* 819—820.

αἵμονες ὡς ἐπαμίδαι
πρὸ δουπιαταπίτα

Hermann has restored the latter words thus: 'σ' ἐπ' ἄμαλα "Ἡσει δουπῖαν τὰπὶ γῆ, which besides the change of αμίδα to ἄμαλα involves only the addition of the stroke over Α in ΔΟΥΠΙΑ, and the alteration of Τ to Γ; ησὺ for ἥσει is merely confusion of the sound. Accepting this, I would offer for the first words δαίμων ὅμως: the meaning being 'though you did not perish at sea, nevertheless the Argives will drive you back.' The letters ΔΙ could easily fall out before ΑΙ. The omission or addition of the stroke denoting ν has caused confusion in two other passages of this chorus. In line 824 for ἀτίετ' ἀνὰ πόλιν εὐσεβῶν I would read ἀτίετ' ἀνὰ πόλιν εὐσεβῶ. v. 844 has also been thrown into utter confusion by the omission of the stroke. The MS. gives λῦμασις ὑπρωγαυοι

λασκει. For the last word Hermann wrote ἐλάσκοις, I would add the stroke over the ι of λυμασι, and re-divide: λῦμασιν σὺ πρὸ γῆς ἐλάσκοις. Thus a

seemingly desperate passage is healed with little expense, and without recourse to the fire and steel of Prof. Tucker and others.

Ib. 970.—I choose this verse as a specimen of one emended by a method entirely opposed to that of far-reaching change advocated and practised by Prof. Tucker. The verse, which he calls the 'most corrupt in all Aeschylus,' stands thus in *M*,

καλωρα κωλύουσιν θασμένην ἐρῶ.

Now after editors have told us that this is the 'most corrupt verse in all Aeschylus' etc., and have borne testimony to their belief by the twenty-five conjectures to be seen in Wecklein's appendix, the twenty-sixth which Prof. Tucker gives, and a twenty-seventh which has been proposed by Prof. F. W. Newman, it may appear presumptuous to hint that this twenty-eighth way is the easiest and best, and that the line can be set right by the change of two letters and the omission of a third, thus:

ΚΑΝΩΡΑ κωλύουσιν ὥς μένειν ὄρω.

'Kypriis proclaims the ripe fruit, and I see her hindering the unripe from abiding so,' i.e. she brings it to maturity. ὥς = so, as often in Hom. Herod.; rare in Attic poetry but found *Agam.* 930, εἰ πάντα δ' ὥς πρόσσοιμι ἄν. ὥς and ὄρω are my own, κῶωρα (more liable to corruption than the common κῶωρα) Prof. Newman's.

C. J. BRENNAN,
Sydney, N. S. W.

* *

ON SOPH. *Trach.* 504.

ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τάνδ' ἔρ' ἔκοιτιν
τίνας ἀμφίγυνοι κατέβαν πρὸ γάμων.

('But I will pass on to this bride, to tell what—entered the lists.')

The meaning of the word ἀμφίγυνοι has been very variously explained.

The following meanings have been suggested:

1. With large strong limbs—ἀμφί expressing greatness.
2. Dexterous, well-practised combatants. cf. ἀμφιδέσιος.
3. Armed at all points.

This meaning is derived from Hom. *Il.* 13. 147

οἱ δ' ἄντιοι υἷες Ἀχαιῶν
νόσσοντες ξίφεσιν τε καὶ ἔγχεσιν ἀμφιγούσιον,

but Mr. Leaf in his note objects to this.

His note runs thus: "Generally supposed = 'having a γυῖον at each end,' i.e. the head at one end, and butt, σαυρωτήρ, at the other—but it is not explained how γυῖον which is properly used of the flexible extremities, hands and feet, can be used of the point of a spear, nor how the adjective can be formed from it by dropping the ι. Others have explained it of the spear-head only, as 'having a curve on both sides,' i.e. being of what is known as the 'leaf-shape,' for want of a more satisfactory explanation. I have elsewhere suggested that it may mean 'Elastic,' literally bending to either side.

The existence of the root γυ- to bend is abundantly proved—cf. γυρός, γύαλον, γύης, etc."

4. *Disparis formis*, of unequal form—one a man, the other a bull. (Hermann.)

Of the four meanings suggested the first second and third which are derived from γυῖον are thrown to the ground by Mr. Leaf—and the fourth is too absurd to suit the Epic grandeur of the passage.

And this leaves us with Mr. Leaf's suggestion [at the end of his note], which is I believe on the right

track; i.e. the two rivals wrestled in a most elastic manner, and used both hands and feet in trying to bend round one another and so trip one another up. This is exactly the meaning required, for the poet goes on to speak of the wrestling tricks employed by the combatants:

ἦν δ' ἀμ φίπλεκτοι κλίμακες.

L. H. S.

* *

PLUT. *Them.* xxi.—δύο γὰρ ἦκεν ἐφη θεοὺς κομίζων, Πειθῶ καὶ Βίαν, οἱ δ' ἔφασαν εἶναι καὶ παρ' αὐτοῖς θεοὺς μεγάλους δύο Πενίαν καὶ Ἀπορίαν. No Greek would have spoken of Πειθῶ and the rest as male deities. θεοὺς here is feminine (θεά is poetical), and we must read μεγάλας.

H. RICHARDS.

* *

THE INSCRIBED WHORL FROM TROY.—I observe that in the last number of the *Classical Review* (p. 341) Dr. Meister is quoted as proposing a reading which differs from mine for the Cypriote inscription on the whorl found by Dr. Schliemann at Hissarlik in 1890. It is evident that his reading is taken from the imperfect copy of the inscription which was in the first instance sent to myself. As I considered it unsatisfactory, Dr. Schliemann subsequently sent me the original which I consequently had in my possession for some weeks. I found that the characters are deeply engraved and very clear, all of them presenting well-known forms. About their correct reading there is no room for doubt. They represent the syllables: *pa to ri lu ri*. The interpretation of the reading is of course another question.

A. H. SAYCE.

* *

HERODAS, IV.

30. Instead of πρὸς Μοιρέων I would like to make out of προσμοιρέων an infinitive which would describe the old man (τὸν γέροντα) as taking part in or watching the action of the boy strangling the goose.

36. A statue of a dumb girl whose speech had been restored by Asclepius would be made to look as if she were speaking or even shouting (οὐχ ὀρῆς, Κυνναῖ, ὅπως βεβόηκεν).

55. These lines may describe a picture of a room with open door (in the Pompeian manner) within which are to be seen this and that subject.

66 foll. These lines read like a description of one of those pictures of *bovum immolatio* which Pliny mentions (xxx. 126) as frequent, the best of them being one by the famous painter Pausias, in which the ox seemed to be coming out of the picture.

78. If this line is to be ascribed to Apelles, then we may class it with that other proverbial saying which he, looking round from behind his picture, addressed to a critic, ne supra crepidam sutor judicaret (Pliny xxxv. 85).

A. S. MURRAY.

* *

THUC. iv. 64.—I quite agree with Mr. Carter's rendering of οὐ στερήσομεν (*Class. Rev.* v. 196); but, since he mentions Shilleto as possibly supporting another view, I should like to testify that Shilleto's interpretation was the same, and that he certainly did not wish this passage to be classed with those which he cites on Dem. *F.L.* p. 389 § 151. I have a notebook in which I have preserved his comments on

the fourth book of Thucydides, and his remark on the passage in question is set down as follows:—

οὐ στερήσομεν, i.e. we shall confer: cf. Eur. Or. 1151,

ἐνδὲ γὰρ οὐ σφαλόντες ἔχομεν κλέος
καλῶς θανόντες ἢ καλῶς σέσωσμένοι.

The use of οὐ στερισκόμενοι Thuc. iv. 106 is similar.

G. E. MARINDIN.

* *

LIDDELL AND SCOTT: *s. v.* στρώμα:—III. in pl. also *piles* for building bridges on, Lat. *sublicae*, Polyæn. 8. 23, 9.

Polyaenus is named in the 'list of authors, with the editions referred to,' but no edition is specified. The reading στρώματα occurs in the editions by Casaubon in 1589, by Maaswyck in 1690, and by Mursinna in 1756: but the inevitable emendation σταυρώματα was introduced by Coray in his edition in 1809, and has been adopted by the subsequent editors, Woelfflin in 1860 and Melber in 1887.

CECIL TORR.

ERRATUM.

Page 320, col. 2, line 15, for "munká:" read "munkák."

ARCHAEOLOGY.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GREAT BRITAIN.

London.—In pulling down No. 50 Cornhill, remains were discovered which proved the existence of a Roman house or part of a Roman street, and various interesting objects were brought to light, including bracelets, bits of armour, one or two coins, and vases more or less complete. A fine piece of the Roman wall was also found, surmounted by large slabs of stone, one foot thick, with part of an evidently Roman superstructure.¹

Weyford, near Winchester.—During excavations for building purposes in July a paved way was discovered, composed entirely of small red tiles, 6 feet in width and extending probably for a considerable distance, a length of 14 feet having been uncovered. More recent excavations some 20 feet to the west brought to light an oven or kiln, with three openings, in a very perfect state of preservation: also at 5 yards' distance a chamber about 8 feet square, paved with tiles, the sides coated with reddish plaster. On one side of the latter is a ledge 15 inches from the ground, extending the whole length of the chamber; on the floor is a sunk channel with an outlet for the water at the end. This chamber evidently formed part of a bath. Portions of the partition-walls have also been found, and various bones and ornaments. These discoveries were made about two or three feet below the surface, within a quarter of a mile of other Roman remains found a few months ago.²

Lincoln.—The remains of a fine and spacious Roman villa have been laid bare here, which, from the extent of the tessellated pavements, must have been on a scale almost unrivalled in England. From time to time extensive basement floors have been uncovered, and tentative explorations have shown that there yet remain other floors to be brought to light. One strip of pavement, 144 by 13 feet, has an elaborate pattern of Greek fret down the centre in blue tesserae, with borders of broad bands of white, and narrow bands of red tesserae, alternating. Another strip was laid bare for a space of 81 by 10 feet, cut up into neat patterns, showing that it formed the floor of various rooms.³

Green Street, near Eastbourne.—A large number of circular pits have been found here, 18 inches in

diameter and the same in depth, and another shaped like the letter L, 15 feet long and 5 feet deep, edged with stones. In the latter were fragments of Samian and Upchurch ware, a spindle-whorl, a finely-shaped dark grey patera, burnt corn, shells, and large pieces of lead and copper. In another pit, shaped like a tomb, similar objects were found. These may have been refuse-pits attached to a large villa, or else a place of interment.⁴

Chester.—The excavations in the old city walls during the month of September have resulted in the discovery of four inscribed stones and several pieces of monumental sculpture, which are all believed to date back to the Romano-British period.⁵

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA.

Heidelberg.—In this neighbourhood has been discovered a Roman shop or cellar, in the walls of which were niches for placing objects. Inside one was found a broken relief in stone, representing a figure of a woman holding a cornucopia; her head is lost.⁶

Cologne.—In making the foundations of a new flight of steps at the Cathedral a Roman pavement was discovered, with found bricks for the pilae of hypocausts; also a stone broken in four pieces adorned with two Corinthian columns, with architrave above. This stone is 1 by 0.56 m. in dimensions, and bears an inscription of 164 B.C. (Macrinus et Celsus Coss).⁶

Vienna.—Sixteen Roman tombs have been found here, containing skeletons, twelve coins, a fibula, two urns, and two vases. At Baden in the neighbourhood, the remains of a Roman temple were brought to light, also Roman bricks, lamps, coins, knives, arrows, fragments of vases, bones of animals, etc. A niche in the rock contains the remains of an altar of Mithras. Near Ahrweiler were found seven tombs, containing vases, urns, lamps, etc., all of Roman date.⁶

Salona, in Dalmatia.—A fine marble sarcophagus has been discovered, the front sculptured with reliefs of two winged genii bearing a round disk on which are inscribed the names of two married persons, Valerius Dinens and Attia Valeria. The cover is in the form of a saddle back roof with acroteria at the angles on which are genii and small Cupids. Within

¹ *Pall Mall Budget*, 20 August.

² *Times*, 13 August.

³ *Notes and Queries*, 5 September.

⁴ *Antiquary*, July 1891.

⁵ *Academy*, 12 September.

⁶ *Antiquary*, August 1891.

were two skeletons and various ornaments, including three gold collars with pearls and beads of paste, two gold earrings, a small gold ring with an opal, amber and ivory hair-pins, and twenty-five ivory buttons, used as *tesserae lusoriae*.¹

ITALY.

Rome.—Excavations have been carried on between the Porta Salaria and the Porta Pinciana, during which a headless torso of a statue of Hygieia was found, clothed only in a mantle leaving the right shoulder and breast bare. The left hand formerly held a patera; at her right side is her sacred serpent, the head of which is lost. It is of mediocre style, 0.50 m. in height, and of Carrara marble.

Here was also found a sarcophagus, in perfect preservation, containing the bones apparently of a husband and wife, mixed with earth. In the middle of one side is a medallion with busts of the two persons resting on a branch of acanthus. The woman wears a tunic and mantle, the man a toga with *trabea* passing from the left shoulder beneath the right arm-pit. The features are much obliterated, but the style appears to be that of the third century of our era. Below the medallion is a pastoral scene, representing a shepherd in an *exomis* by a shrub, milking two goats, and another leaning on a knotty staff, playing on the shepherd's pipe. On the right-hand side is the figure of a bearded man with long hair, of Greek type; he wears a philosopher's cloak, leaving the right arm and part of the breast bare, and appears to be in the act of speaking. On the other side is a female figure in tunic and mantle, her arms wrapped in the drapery, the right as in statues of Pudicitia; two locks of hair fall on the neck. This figure is also of Greek type. On the top of the sarcophagus are two gryphons in very low relief. It is of Pentelic marble, 2.20 × 0.72 × 0.65 m. in dimensions.²

GREECE.

Athens.—Acquisitions of the Central Museum: (1) a marble hydria, of Hellenistic style, the neck and handle lost, 0.45 m. high. On it is a relief of a female figure seated on a chair with back and footstool, and a maiden standing before her, touching her throat with her left hand. Above is the inscription ΕΥΚΛΕΑ. It was found in the excavations for the Peiraean railway. (2) A slab (0.90 × 0.60 m.), with a relief representing a shrine with *parasitades* and pediment, in which one female and two male figures are standing. The female on the right places her right arm on the shoulder of the male figure in the centre, embracing him. It is of late Roman date. On the architrave is scratched the inscription:

Ζώϊλος

Ζώσας Ζώϊλου Τειχίππου ὀνησιφόρου.

(3) Two fragments of a Roman relief, with two headless figures, male and female, and a small figure between, all much mutilated. (4) The upper half of a sepulchral relief, with the head of a female figure, much injured. On the architrave is inscribed: Κλεοστράτη Καλλιμάχη. It is of Hellenistic date; dimensions 0.60 × 0.20 m.

In the excavations for the Peiraean railway to the north-east of the Theseion was found a rectangular base of Parian marble, 0.74 × 0.76 × 0.325 m. On one side was inscribed:

ΦΥΛΑΡΧΟΥΝΤΕΣ ΕΝΙΚΩΝΑΝΘΙΡΡΑΣΙΑΙ
ΔΗΜΑΙΝΕΤΟΣ ΔΗΜΕΟΡΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ
ΔΗΜΕΑΣ ΔΗΜΑΙΝΕΤΟΡΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ
ΔΗΜΟΣ ΘΕΝΗΣ ΔΗΜΑΙΝΕΤΟΡΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ
ΒΡΥΑΞΙΣ ΕΠΟΗΣΕΝ

On each of the other sides is sculptured in relief a tripod, and a bearded horseman in a chlamys. On the top is visible the hole in which the *ἀνάθημα* was inserted, probably a bronze tripod with a circular base, and a projection which went into the hole still remaining in the centre of the pedestal; or else it may have supported an Ionic column with Attic base, on which the *ἀνάθημα* was placed. The three *φύλαρχοι* are unknown, so that the date cannot be accurately ascertained, but it was probably made by Bryaxis in his youth, before he went to Halikarnassos, to judge from the inscription. Pliny gives his date as Ol. 117 = 312 B.C. The three horsemen are of course the three *φύλαρχοι*, one being father of the other two. The *ἀνάθημα* must refer to some victory they won as *φύλαρχοι*. It was a privately, not publicly, erected monument, which again points to its being made by Bryaxis in his youth. For the *ἀντιπασσία* cf. Köhler, *C.I.A.* ii. 1291 and *Ath. Mittl.* ix. (1884), p. 49.

In the same excavations was found a fragment of another base of Pentelic marble (0.42 × 0.16 × 0.10 m.), inscribed:

Γάϊον Καρρεῖναν Γαίῳ υἱὸν Σεκοῦνδον φιλο-
κάισαρα τὸν ἐπώνυμ[ον] ἄρχοντα καὶ ἱερέα
Δ[ρο]ύσου ὑπάτου

[ἡ ἐξ 'Αρείου πάγον Βουλῆς καὶ ἡ βουλὴ τῶν χ' καὶ
ὁ δήμος, κ.τ.λ.]

The term *ἱερεὺς Δρούσου* points to a date between 9 B.C. and 126 A.D. (cf. Dittenberger, in *Ephem. Epigr.* i. p. 116, and *C.I.A.* iii. 1009). Dio Cassius (liv. 20) mentions a *Καρπίας Σεκοῦνδος*, cf. also Juv. iii. 7, 203, and Tac. Ann. xv. 45—xvi. 23. The most probable date is about A.D. 65.

Outside the Kerameikos has been excavated a small *τετράγωνον*, or rectangular sepulchre, of unburnt brick, in which was a *τάφος κεκαυμένος* (or tomb containing a burnt corpse), with a covering of the same material. Near this were found similar tombs, on some of which were found large vases of the Dipylon style, evidently erected originally as *ἐπιτύμβια μνημεῖα*, answering to our gravestones.³

Thespieae.—To the 200 inscriptions already discovered, 150 more have to be added, taken out of the walls of the Eremonastron, which were found to have been built mostly of ancient materials, and will now be entirely demolished, so as to preserve all the antiquities they contain. Among various sculptures brought to light are an archaic head of Apollo, some figures of animals, statues of women, and bas-reliefs.⁴

Serres, Western Roumelia. — On the south-east slope of the ancient acropolis, which covers the old Macedonian and Roman burial-place, there was found on March 10th, at the depth of four metres, an interesting stele (1 × 0.50 × 0.10 m.), with an inscription of 36 lines containing a long list of names. The date is A.D. 41.⁵

ASIA MINOR.

Magnesia.—The sacred enclosure of the temple of Artemis Leukophryne has been made out, and all the

¹ *Antiquary*, July 1891.

² *Bull. Comm. Arch.*, May and June 1891.

³ *Δελτιον*, April and May 1891.

⁴ *Athenaeum*, 8 August.

⁵ *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 20 June.

remains of the temple itself brought to light. Portions of the frieze were discovered, much damaged, and in digging out the theatre and the remains of a portico, many inscriptions were found.¹

CRETE.

The archaic statue discovered at Eleutherna last year has been more thoroughly examined by Dr. Loewy, who considers it the first example of an early style indigenous to the island, and carried by the pupils of Daedalos into Greece. The upper part alone remains, and the existence of colour can only be surmised from the lines which divide the body into bands, and by some traces of rosettes. The hair falls in eight curls down the back over a close-fitting chiton fastened by a girdle round the waist. The figure was at first thought to be an ephebus, but is now considered by Dr. Loewy to be a woman, from the slightly swelling breasts, as in the statue dedicated by Nikandra at Delos. It bears a strong likeness to a statue discovered by the French at Tegea, for which place statues were made by Endoios and Cheirosophos, both of Crete.¹

CYPRUS.

In 1890 Drs. Dörpfeld and Ohniefelsch-Richter discovered remains of an ancient mountain-cult on the ridge of Pedalion, consisting of a temenos with numerous stone sculptures of life-size and over, also remains of destroyed statues and the primitive walls of the peribolos, which were intended to shut off the sacred mountain. This may have been a temenos of Aphrodite (cf. Strabo iv. 682).²

The chief results of the excavations at Salamis in 1890 are as follows:—

The plan of the agora was made out, and numerous inscriptions were found in it, from pedestals of honorary statues, partly of Ptolemaic date, partly of the early empire. The only other find of importance was the great bull's-head capital (see p. 343). The agora consisted of a double colonnade enclosing an open space 701 feet long and 110 feet wide, or, reckoning in the walls, 192 feet. The columns were of the Corinthian order, and the floor was paved with mosaics. At one end was a large *louttron*, at the other the stoa and cella-walls of a temple, 96 × 72 feet, where most of the inscriptions were found; from these it would seem that it was dedicated to Zeus Olympios. The temple and agora were both of Roman date, rebuilt at the same time. The *louttron* is the only part still standing; its dimensions are 194 × 72 feet. The walls consisted of large blocks of squared stone, with pier-buttresses on the south side; the interior formed a large pillared hall, with four aisles of thirteen bays, vaulted over. It was probably used as a *castellum* for supplying the town with water, as there is an aqueduct in connection with it, and it is not fitted internally for a bath.

The temenos of Zeus in the 'sand-site' was also excavated; it is a four-sided colonnade of late date, 168 × 125 feet. The column-walls are of slight construction, with plain pillars and Corinthian caps of marble. The chief finds on this site were limestone and marble statues, of which the best are a Serapis seated on a throne with Cerberus by his side (now at Cambridge), a female figure above life-size, perhaps Hygieia, an Athene of Roman date (now at Oxford), a fine female portrait-head, and a nude male torso, of the type of the Hermes of Andros.

On the 'cistern-site' were found fragments of limestone and terra-cotta statuettes, broken pottery, figures with offerings and seated female figures, and

standing figures wrapped in mantles, some with traces of painting. Of the pottery the most interesting fragments are of the oriental style, and one of late b.f. style, closely resembling a kylix in the British Museum (B 377).

At Τοῦμα was found a remarkable series of painted terra-cotta figures of archaic type, dating about 650 to 550 B.C., mostly bearded and draped, carrying flowers. The best example is given in *J. H. S.* xii. pl. 9. They are painted in red and black, the hair treated in oriental style, and the drapery brilliantly decorated with scale, flower, and lotos patterns, imitative of oriental embroidery. Other types are male figures carrying kids and animals, of which the most interesting are bulls with a row of lamps down the back. Also various limestone figures, and a series of fifty or sixty inscriptions, mostly late, including one or two syllabaries.³

Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. xii. pt. 1. April, 1891.

1. The north doorway of the Erechtheum. R. W. Schultz. (3 plates.)

He shows that part of the original doorway is *in situ*; the main jambs are of a period slightly later than the date of the building, and the lintel, brackets, and cornice still later insertions.

Mr. E. A. Gardner adds a note on the evidence from the Erechtheum inscription, and considers that Mr. Schultz's view helps to explain some difficult passages.

2. 'Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. R. W. Macan.

3. Archaic reliefs at Dhimitzana. G. C. Richards. (With plate.)

A discussion of three archaic bone plaques, either votive, or forming part of the decoration of a cista, representing two warriors and a female. They are genuine specimens of early Spartan art, and are probably *ἀναθήματα* to some mythical heroic personages of a Spartan cult.

4. Sculpture in Sicilian museums (Palermo, Girgenti, Catania and Syracuse). L. R. Farnell.

5. Excavations in Cyprus, 1890. J. A. R. Munro and H. A. Tubbs. (7 plates.)

6. Notes on the antiquities of Mycenae. W. M. Flinders Petrie.

He finds a basis for an approximate chronology in the discovery of other pre-Hellenic tombs in Greece, and the discoveries in Egypt. The flourishing period of pre-Hellenic art was about 1500 to 1400 B.C., when intercourse with Egypt was common. The treasury-tombs date from 1500 to 1200; about 1150 B.C. graves were made in the form of a circle at Mycenae; from 1100 to 800 (the date of the Dorian migration) the prevalent decorations are in impressed glass. The bee-hive tombs of Menidi and the private tombs are of this date. The range of civilization was from the north of Europe down to Egypt, not only by distant trade, but by familiar intercourse. These facts accord with the dates derived from the literary record of Egypt.

7. A journey in Cilicia Tracheia. J. T. Bent. (With plates.)

A description of Kanygelleis (a deme of Sebaste), where various inscriptions were found; of the Alban cave, with cave-temples and a propylaeon dedicated to Hermes; of the Corycian cave, with the ruins of the town and temple; of Uzunja-burdj, with the temple of the Alban Jove and a great fortress on the hill of the upper town; and of Meidan, with ruins of a wall of polygonal masonry.

8. Inscriptions from Western Cilicia. E. L. Hicks. A supplement to the last article.

¹ *Athenaeum*, 8 August.

² *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1 August.

³ *Journ. Hell. Stud.* xii. pt. 1, April 1891.

Archaeological Journal, No. 190. June 1891.

1. Some tombs in Crete of the Mycenaean period. Rev. J. Hirst.

A description of three coffers with lids, shaped like baths, found in arched chambers with *δρόμοι*. The shape of the tombs recalls the Phrygian huts, and the ark-shaped coffers resemble the more advanced sort of dwelling in use at that time (cf. the Tugurium-vase in the British Museum).

2. Roman antiquities of Augsburg and Ratisbon. Bunnell Lewis.

A description of various antiquities in the Augsburg Museum, including a miliarium with an inscription of Septimius Severus, relating to the repair of roads; an inscription of a temple built at Aelia Augusta (Augsburg); a sign of a wineshop (?), representing a cask on a cart; a monument of two *dumviri* (?) in niches side by side, under elliptical arches; a statue of Hermes carrying a winged child (probably Eros), and a fine mosaic pavement.

3. Notes on Bath as a Roman city. Emanuel Green, F.S.A.

He discusses the extent of the city, and the position of the four cross-roads; the route of the Fosse-way was probably along the line of the present High-street, from north to south.

4. Some recent archaeological discoveries in Lincoln. Rev. Precentor Venables.

An account of some bits of the city-wall discovered in June 1890, and of the traces of a Roman villa a mile east of the city.

Antiquary, July 1891.

Quarterly notes on Roman Britain. F. Haverfield.

The most important note is on a Romano-British village at Bampton, Oxon., the inhabitants of which appear to have been very little civilised. Pits were found there similar to those found near Eastbourne (*vid. supra*).

At Binchester, to the south of Hadrian's wall, an altar was erected by Pomponius Donatus, beneficiary of the consular legate, to Jupiter and the *matres otlototae* (probably a Keltic word), *sive transmarinae*.

Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift. 11 July, 1891.

P. 886. Fünfzigstes Programm zum Winckelmannsfeste, Berlin, 1890. (Review of, by Fritz Baumgarten).

Dr. C. Robert writes on 'Homerische Becher,' *i.e.* hemispherical cups of stamped red clay, of metallic appearance, dating about the third century B.C. The designs appear to be derived from silver models, and are closely taken from Homer, with verses from the poems appended.

Dr. F. Winter discusses a relief found in 1875 on the Esquiline (now in the Conservatorium), representing a Maenad, probably the Greek original of the many Roman replicas of the so-called Chimairo-phonos. It formed part of the base of a choregic tripod. Dr. Winter identified four more of the Maenads at Madrid, one resembling the Venus Genetrix, which he ascribes to Kalamis, but the date seems too early for the relief. Dr. Furtwängler writes on a small Argive bronze in the Berlin Museum, and a fifth-century vase with a representation of Orpheus.

H. B. WALTERS.

AMONG the objects discovered last season at Salamis, one of the most interesting is a mutilated statue of Serapis enthroned, with Cerberus by his side. The figure—the head of which is unfortunately missing—is in dark blue marble; and at once arrests

the eye by the peculiar treatment of the drapery, which is exceptionally light and clings closely to the form beneath. The arrangement of the folds is also to be noted, especially on the upper part of the body; and the disposition of the two ends—one pendent from the left shoulder, the other flung across the lap—deserves attention. The grouping of Cerberus with Hades is sufficiently unusual in itself to make the statue remarkable, but is not unexampled, as, to go no further afield, may be seen by a marble in the Graeco-Roman Room of the British Museum. The Salamis statue is published and described in our report of the excavations [*J. H. S.* 1891].

WHILST in Rome during the autumn and early winter of last year I kept a look-out for possible replicas of this statue, which from the first had seemed to me to possess a strong individualism. My search was not unrewarded. In the Chiaramonti Gallery of the Vatican is a statuette of Hades enthroned, which bears in every respect a striking resemblance to the marble from Salamis. It is of similar material, dark blue, almost purple, in tint, with flesh parts in white, as had been the case with our Salamis figure. It is true there is here no Cerberus, but the figure of the god is similar in all other details, there is the same peculiar treatment and arrangement of the drapery, the same half-impatient pose of the lower limbs, the same disposition of the arms. The statuette, which has an inclusive height of about 60 cm. has been broken and in parts restored: but, owing to the place which it occupies on the uppermost shelf in the Gallery, it is difficult to say what is ancient, what modern. The blue marble is throughout untouched: and of the white portions the head and feet may be ancient, the arms modern. On the arms are puntelli as though the restoration had been carried out in the light of an extant statue.

MORE important and of larger size is a statue in the Museo dei Conservatori [Sala rotonda]. This also agrees almost exactly with the Salamis figure: Cerberus however is more to the front, the throne, especially on the left side, is more in evidence, the legs more widely sundered and the right somewhat more advanced. But the arrangement and rendering of the drapery are the same; and there is no mistaking the connection between this work and that from Salamis. The material is white marble. In its present state the figure is 1.10m. high, inclusive of base: the polis when complete would have added another 6 or 7 cm. It is a much poorer copy than that discovered at Salamis, as would indeed be indicated by the change of material; but has the advantage of preserving the head, whose type is noteworthy. The cheek-bones are high and the eyes with their protruding ball and sharply recessed corners are rendered in such a manner as to give an almost savage effect. The general form of the head with its slight forward stoop and upward glance is later than the type represented by the Zeus of Otricoli.

THERE may exist many other replicas of this work: I have had no opportunity of examining other museums in search of them. But the existence even of three agreeing so completely in all essentials as do those here enumerated is sufficient proof of a common archetype. Unfortunately we seem to have no record of any important treatment of Zeus-Serapis other than that of Bryaxis, of whom we know practically nothing. The type of our example belongs to a post-Lysippean school, and, if we may trust the head of the Conservatori statue, to that school which is represented by the Eros with the bow, and some

other youthful types. At least there is a similar proportion observed; though subject and treatment are sufficiently diverse.

H. A. TUBBS.

Archaeologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich-Ungarn. Vol. xiv. Vienna. 1891.

1. E. B(ormann); publishes a series of leaden Greek weights from various places in the Dobrudscha; six cuts. 2. Klein; the 'Enkriomenos' of Alkamenos; this title has never been satisfactorily explained, nor has any corresponding type of statue been found; he proposes to read Encriomenos, of an athlete anointing himself with oil, similar to the fine statue in Munich and replicas elsewhere. 3. Tocilescu; ninety-six new Greek and Latin inscriptions from the Dobrudscha; including a long decree from Tomi; on account of the repeated incursions of Karian pirates, the state appoints two officials who are to select forty men for the guarding of the town gates, and for patrol service in the city; the latter part records the honours paid to the officials (ἡγεμόνες) and the watch (ἐπισκευτοί). 4. Szanto; note on the *πυλῶροι* (Akropolis police) inscriptions. 5. Ladek; publishes a series of antiquities from Brigetio, a bronze cup with a sacrifice in relief, bronze statuettes, &c., with woodcuts. 6. Patsch, two Greek inscriptions from Knidos in a private collection. 7. Fröhlich; eighty-eight Roman inscriptions from Pannonia inferior and superior. 8. v. Premerstein; epigraphical notes from Steiermark and Krain; notes on twenty Latin inscriptions. 9. Jung; five Latin inscriptions from Siebenbürgen. 10. Patsch; old and new Praetorian inscriptions from Aquileia. 11. Cumont; sixteen Latin inscriptions from Dacia, new and revised. 12. Gerojanis; eight Greek inscriptions from Nikopolis. 13. Kubitschek; Roman find at Klosterneuburg. 14. Szanto; Themistokles and the old Athene temple; argues that the Athene ἡ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν μεδούσα (*Bull. de Corr. Hell.* xii., p. 154; cf. *Plut. Them.* 10) was the goddess of the older temple, so called to distinguish her from the Polias in the Erechtheion. 15. Gurliitt; publishes a bronze terminal statuette of Jupiter Heliopolitanus. 16. The same; the Thrasy-medes son of Arignotos of Paros, of the Epidauros inscription ('*Εφ. Ἀρχ.* 1886, p. 145) may be assigned to about the middle of the fourth century; he may be identified also with the Thrasy-medes who did the joiner's work, thus showing that even down to this date there were examples of handicraftsmen who were also great artists. 17. Kubitschek; Roman inscriptions from Brigetio. 18. The same; on the use of the tribe-names Arnensis and Aniensis. 19. The same; a Roman inscription from Carnuntum. 20. Frankfurter; fifty-eight Greek and Roman inscriptions from Bulgaria. 21. Hauser; excavations in Carnuntum, with plan of amphitheatre. 22. Ornstein; the Roman settlement at Szamos-Ujvár; with plan of the site, and Roman inscriptions. C. S.

THE Cambridge Antiquarian Society has just issued No. 31 of its *Communications*, and this contains papers read as recently as the spring of the year before last. Among these is a paper by Prof. Middleton on an oenochoe belonging to the Rev. S. S. Lewis, since deceased. This oenochoe is of the later Greek form, with masks and festoons in relief, and is coated with blue Egyptian glaze: coloured plate. The words βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαίου φιλοπάτορος are incised on the neck. It was found in Cyprus.

C. T.

Römische Mittheilungen. 1891. Part 1. Rome.

1. Michaelis gives a very elaborate account of the growth of the collection of antiquities at the Capitol in Rome down to the inauguration of the museum in 1734: three plates and three woodcuts. 2. Mau contributes some notes on Pompeii, qualifying former opinions about the Basilica: two woodcuts. 3. Huelsen makes his second report upon discoveries and researches affecting the topography of Rome, giving a summary of results published between April 1889 and December 1890, and subjecting many of these results to very severe criticism: two dozen woodcuts. C. T.

Revue numismatique. Pt. 2, 1891.

A. S. Dorigny. 'Aurélien et la guerre des monnaies.'—*Chronique.* Description of two *teserae* (?) of porcelain with the types of Ptolemaic coins. These pieces were found in Egypt and have been presented to the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, by M. Maspero.

Numismatische Zeitschrift. (Vienna) 1890. Vol. xxii.

K. B. Hofmann. 'Ueber eine Anzahl griechischer Gewichte.'—A. Markl. 'Die Reichsmünzstätten unter der Regierung des Quintillus und ihre Emissionen.'

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique. March—April. 1891.

J. de Rougé. 'Les personnages sur les monnaies des nomes.' Maintains that the figures represented on Egyptian nome-coins are the gods of the nomes and not, as Frochner suggested, merely personifications of the nomes.—The number for May—June contains no articles on Classical numismatics.

Numismatic Chronicle. 1891. Part. ii.

Warwick Wroth. 'Greek coins acquired by the British Museum in 1890.' 177 Greek coins have been acquired during the year. Thirty-one of the most important specimens are here described. Among these may be noted the following:—*Sparadocus*, King of the *Odryssae*. A rare tetradrachm. *Amadocus*, King of the *Odryssae*. Bronze. Reasons are suggested for assigning this and similar coins to Amadocus II. and Teres III. instead of to Amadocus I. and Teres II. *Alexander of Pherae*. A silver coin inscribed ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΙΟΝ, *sc.* τριόβολον. Specimens of the *στατήρ* and *δραχμή* inscribed respectively ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΙΟΣ and ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΙΑ had previously been published. *Latus in Crete*. An Imperial coin indicating the importance of this place under the early Empire. *Cnidus*. New silver coin with a beautiful head of Aphrodite. *Olba in Cilicia*. Bronze coin with types of club and fortress, interesting in connection with recent discoveries in Cilicia Tracheia.—W. Wroth. 'Eupolemus.' On coins attributed to Eupolemus, general of Cassander of Macedon. Gives details as to their provenance and suggests Mylasa as their mint-place. A note by Prof. W. M. Ramsay on the site of Hylarima in Caria (emending Diod. Sic. xix. 68) is appended.—Col. F. Warren. 'Notes on coins found in Cyprus.'—John Evans. 'On some rare and unpublished Roman medallions [in the writer's own collection].'*Miscellanea.* E. Thurston. 'A further discovery of Roman coins in Southern India.' Roman denarii, Augustus to Nero. W. W.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Kuhn's Zeitschrift. Band xxxi. Heft 3. [Continued from vol. v. p. 135.]

This number contains a long and important paper by P. Kretschmer. I. The action of the original I.E. accent works not merely regressively but also progressively, affecting the ablaut not only in preceding but also in following syllables. This is illustrated at great length in various types of inflexion. II. The current theory that the ablaut *e* : *o* is connected with change of accent is not well grounded. The alternation of *i* : *e*, *u* : *o* in Greek, *a* : *e* in Latin is due to a shifting of accent (Kretschmer is apparently unaware of Mr. Wharton's proof of the Latin change). I.E. *i*, *u* discussed : partly due to the reduction of a diphthong, partly to contraction of *i*, *u* with a short vowel. Accented *g* = Greek *ap*, unaccented *g* = Greek *pa*. The ordinary theory of the doubling of the liquids (*rr*, *ll*) disputed, and a new explanation advanced of *udatta*-roots. III. 1. Initial combinations of labials and gutturals with dentals go back to a reduction of a fuller form with a vowel, e.g. *βδεώ* = *badēō* from *√ ped-* in *pēdo* (*pēdo*). Initial *ks*, *ps* alternate with *s*, *kt*, *bd*, *pt* with *t*, *d*. The relation of Greek *κτ*, *χθ*, *φθ* to Arian *kz*, where the second letter must be dental, not spirant in character. 2. *u*-epenthesis, which Kretschmer believes to be a phenomenon of the original language. There is an appendix on the treatment of I.E. *ou* in Latin. F. Solmsen on I.E. pronominal stem *eno-* in *ἐκείνος*, *ὁ δεινός*.

Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, tome 7. fasc. 1. [A summary of fasc. 2 appeared in vol. v. p. 243.]

M. Bréal discusses adversely (1) the theory that the termination of the first plural in French is by analogy from *sumus*, (2) Brugmann's explanation of the origin of the feminine gender. He has a second paper on 'Irradiation grammaticale', i.e. the phenomenon by which a suffix, originally of vague meaning, acquires a special signification by virtue of its attaching to a particular word and then becomes more widely extended to form derivatives from words of a different type—e.g. *ναυτία* produces *ναυτία*, on which is formed *ὀδοντία* etc.—*ἀμβλακίσκω* is connected with *ἀμαρτάνω* (root *μαδ*, *μαρ*)—*προνομή* owes its form to *ἐνομή*, *ἀνομή*.—Note on two Oscan inscriptions—*strenae* (quasi *saturnae*!)—*diuturnus*—*tergorare*—*coelum*—*rabies* (*βέμβω*)—*studeo*—*forda*—*suescere* and other words—L. Havet on *canaba*, *curculio*—A. Meillet illustrates from Armenian the law that a velar is unlabialised after *u*—E. Andouin on vocalic prothesis. F. de Saussure on the forms of the number six in I.E.—*φροντός* Goth. *baírhts*—*λγύς* for *Flgús* becoming *Λυγύς* (*r*, *ʃ* become *λγ*, *ρυ* before a velar) and then by dissimilation *λγύς*—*ἀκέων* (cf. *ἀκήκοφα*) *τερίμαι* (cf. *quie-s*)—*ἐπιτηδές*—*περί* (= *ἐπερί*)—*ἦνια* (*h̥s-io-* from reduced root of *nāsus*)—*ἀκρυδεις*—*ιγής*—*χφ* for *ks*, *ps* before a consonant in *τεχνη* (*tezo*), *ἐφθός* (*ēpho*). Attic *ρη* for *pa* in *κρήνη*, *εἰρήνη*, *Κυρήνη*—*υμνο-* for *-ομνο-* in *πρόμνος*, *νόμνος*.

Fasc. 3.—M. Bréal on the pronunciation of *f* in the Italian dialects and on the inscription in an unknown language discovered at Lemnos, which he supposes to be in the tongue of *Σύριες ἀγρόφωνοι* of Od. 8. 294. *Silenta*, *fluenta*, and *cruentus* (the last two by analogical formation) preserve the old form of the pres. part. not contaminated with *i*-stems. *Umbra-tis* *exercitatio* originally signified *σκιαμαχία*—*serus* originally meant 'heavy,' so 'slow,' 'late': cf.

serius—*dat* in *Aen.* 9. 266 is an old unaugmented aorist. In *tibi consultum volo*, *consultum* preserves an old inf. form; *monitos eos volo* originates in a misunderstanding.

Deutsche Literaturzeitung. 1890.

No. 19. Huemer, *die Genesis des Entschlusses in den Tragödien des Euripides und Sophokles, oder über den objectiven Character der griechischen Tragödie. Eine ästhetische Studie.* 'The author applies to ancient the rule of modern tragedy,—pronouncing sentence according to laws which ought themselves to be brought before the bar.'—Bruchmann, *Psychologische Studien zur Sprachgeschichte.* 'A unique and important book. On a well-known linguistic fact the author builds to the skies a system of psychological and metaphysical speculation. The linguistic researches are thorough and extended with critical acumen and observations from the most varied departments of life and knowledge. But the book is uncommonly hard reading, and the conclusion does not express clearly the result of the whole work.'—Christiansen, *de Apicibus et longis inscriptionum latin-arum* (Inaug. Diss.) 'Diligent and, in part, useful; but with much doubtful matter.'

No. 20. v. Arnim, *Quellenstudien zu Philo von Alexandria.* I. 'Περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου' goes back to three sources, viz. (a) a treatise which tried to compromise between Plato and Aristotle (p. 226, 3—235, 6 B.), (b) a polemical peripatetic essay against the Stoa (p. 221, 8—226, 2 and chaps. viii.—xix.), (c) another peripatetic treatise (the second and fourth proof of Critolaus, second part of chap. xx., chap. xxii., and last part). The arguments of (c) have their source in Antipater's (?) *περὶ γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς τοῦ κόσμου*. II. Gives new support to the assumption of Heraclitism in Aenesidemus by showing Heraclitean influence in Philo *περὶ μέθης* M. I. 383—388 *De Jos.* M. II. 59 ff. III. 'De plantatione' p. 350 ff. (*εἰ μεθυσθήσεται ὁ σοφός*) goes back to a stoic-peripatetic treatise, which was perhaps used also by Seneca ep. 83.—Franke, *De Siliii Italici Punicorum tropis.* F. ought to have confined himself to what is characteristic in Silius, and to have paid more attention to S.'s indebtedness to his predecessors.

No. 21. Pauli Orosii *historiarum adversus paganos* lib. vii. ed. Langemeister. Reprint of the text of ed. maior in the Vienna C S E L, without critical apparatus. A few changes in the text.—Schmitt, *Über den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griechischen* (Schanz's *Beitr.* z. *hist. Synt.* III. 2) Sch. has confined himself to the Homeric language and hence deprived himself of valuable material which later authors would have yielded. The second chap. (on the Verb) is weak. But the first has a very careful and instructive discussion of the different forms of relative substantive-clauses in Homer.—Dumond, *Le Théâtre de Polyclète.* An unsuccessful and idle attempt to reconstruct the geometrical ground-plan of the antique theatre.

No. 22. Link, *Die Einheit des Pastor Hermas.* Baumgärtner, *Die Einheit des Hermasbuches.* Both try, as it seems unsuccessfully, to prove the unity of the Pastor Hermas; L. the unity of the book as a whole, while B. claims that the visions, although by the same author, do not belong to the rest of the book.—H. Schmidt, *Handbuch der lateinischen und griechischen Synonymik.* No abridgement of Sch.'s larger *Synonymik*, but entirely independent. Too little attention is paid to the historical development and

change of meaning. But the great mass of collected material and many happy suggestions make the book valuable.—Cagnat, *Cours d'épigraphie latine*. II. ed. Improved and enlarged. Chiefly practical.—Hauhold, *De rebus Riensium*. A careful and critical collection of all that can be gleaned from literary epigraphic and numismatic sources.

No. 23. Guldpenning, *Die Kirchengeschichte des*

Theodoret. 'Its main source is Rufinus, but a large number of passages show Th.'s dependence on Socrates and Sozomenos. There are also traces of his having used Philostorgius and Sabinus.'—Diels, *Sibyllinische Blätter*. D. ingeniously and successfully proves, that the oracular verses quoted in the tenth chapter of Phlegon's *Mirabilia* are genuine, and remnants of the official Roman *libri fatales*.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

Aristotle on the Athenian Constitution. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by F. G. Kenyon. 12mo. 164 pp. Bell & Sons. 4s. 6d.

Aristotle's Constitution of Athens. Translated for English Readers and Students by Thomas J. Dymes. Post 8vo. 160 pp. Seeley. 2s. 6d.

Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens. Translated by E. Poste, M.A. Post 8vo. x, 108 pp. Macmillan & Co. 3s. 6d.

Belton (R.) A Digest of Latin Grammar Examination Questions. Post 8vo. 148 pp. Simpkin. 2s. 6d. Key, 2s. 6d.

Caesar. Civil War. Book I. Edited, with Notes and Vocabulary, by Malcolm Montgomery. xxvii, 141 pp. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.

Cicero. Pro Plancio. Edited by H. A. Holden. New and revised edition. Cambridge Press. 4s. 6d.

Euripides. Plays. Translated into English prose from the text of Paley, by Edward Coleridge. Vol. II. Post 8vo. 470 pp. Bell & Sons. 6s.

— *Iphigenia in Aulis*. Edited, with Introduction and Critical and Explanatory Notes, by E. B. England. 8vo. 186 pp. Macmillan & Co. 7s. 6d.

Herondas. ἩΡΩΝΔΟΥ ΜΙΜΙΑΜΒΟΙ. A First Recension by William Gunion Rutherford, M.A., LL.D. xii, 48 pp. 8vo. Sewed. 2s. net.

Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum, including the newly-discovered Poems of Herondas. With Autotype Facsimiles. 8vo. Frowde. 7s. 6d.

Homer. Iliad. Translated into English prose by John Purves. Edited, with an Introduction, by Evelyn Abbott. 8vo. Percival. 18s. net.

— *Odyssey*. IX. X. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendix on the Dialect, by J. H. Haydon and A. H. Allcroft. Post 8vo. Clive. 2s. 6d.

Horace. Satires. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, &c., by F. G. Plaistowe and A. F. Burnet. Post 8vo. Clive. 6s. 6d.

John Gilpin. A Latin Elegiac Version (two lines to a stanza), published for Head-Masters and Classical Teachers only. Cr. 8vo. 12 pp. Swd. D. Nutt. 9d.

Juvenal. Satires VIII. X. and XIII. Edited by A. H. Allcroft. Text and Notes. Cr. 8vo. Clive. 3s. 6d.

Kennedy (B. H.) Exercises on the Shorter Latin Primer. By M. G. and J. E. Kennedy and H. Wilkinson. Longman. 1s. 6d.

— *Key to Exercises on the Shorter Latin Primer*. By M. G. and J. E. Kennedy and H. Wilkinson. Longman. 2s. 6d. net.

Livy. Book II. Edited by H. Belcher. Notes, &c. Cr. 8vo. 224 pp. Longman. 2s. 6d.

Mahaffy (J. P.) A History of Classical Greek Literature. Vol. I. 2 parts. 3rd edition. Revised and enlarged. Post 8vo. 570 pp. Macmillan & Co. 4s. 6d. each.

Morice (F. D.) Loculi: a Junior Latin Reading Book. Fcap. 207 pp. Percival. 2s.

Plautus. Captivi. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by A. R. S. Hallidie. 12mo. Macmillan & Co. 3s. 6d.

Quintilian. Institutionis Oratoriae liber decimus. A Revised Text, with Introductory Essays, Critical and Explanatory Notes, and a facsimile of the Harleian MS., by W. Peterson. 8vo. lxxx, 227 pp. Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.

Rowe (T. B.) Greek Syntax and Note-book, for use in Upper Forms of Schools. 8vo. 176 pp. Percival. 7s. 6d.

Schliemann (Dr.) Excavations at Troy, Tiryns, Mycenae, Orchomenos, Ithaca, presented in the light of recent knowledge, by Dr. Carl Schuchhardt. Authorised Translation by Miss Eugenie Sellers. With Appendix on latest researches by Drs. Schliemann and Dörpfeld, and Introduction by Walter Leaf. Illustrated with Two Portraits, Maps, Plans, and 290 Woodcuts. 8vo. Macmillan. 18s. net.

Tacitus. Annals I. II. A Translation, with test-papers on Book II. By W. F. Masom and J. Thompson. Cr. 8vo. 108 pp. Clive. 2s. 6d.

Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature. Edited by J. Armitage Robinson, B.D., Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Christ's College.

Vol. I. No. 1. The Apology of Aristides on behalf of the Christians. Edited from a Syriac MS., with an Introduction and Translation by J. Rendel Harris, M.A., Professor of Biblical Languages in Haverford College, Pennsylvania, formerly Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, and an Appendix containing the chief part of the original Greek, by J. Armitage Robinson, B.D. Demy 8vo. 5s.

No. 2. The Passion of St. Perpetua. The Latin Text freshly edited from the Manuscripts, with an Introduction and Appendix containing the Original Latin Form of the Scillitan Martyrdom; by J. Armitage Robinson, B.D. (Editor). Demy 8vo. 4s.

No. 3. The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church. With Special Notes on the Controverted Clauses, by F. H. Chase, B.D., Christ's College, Principal of the Clergy Training School, Cambridge. Demy 8vo. 4s.

Thucydides. Book II. Edited, with Introduction, Critical Notes, and Commentary, by E. C. Marchant. 12mo. Macmillan & Co. 3s. 6d.

— *History*. Book VII. The Text newly revised and explained, with Introduction, Summaries, Maps and Indexes, by H. A. Holden. Fcap. 448 pp. Cambridge University Press. 5s.

Xenophon. Anabasis. Book I. With Map, Plan, Notes, Vocabulary and Exercises for Translation. Edited by H. K. Heatley. Cr. 8vo. 132 pp. Percival. 2s.